LUNGR EN AMENDMENT TRIGGERS CONCERN ABOUT FUTURE OF U.S. REFUGEE PROGRAM

A proposed measure that could dramatically shift the responsibility, direction, and character of the U.S. refugee program became the subject of debate in Washington policy circles early this month.

The measure, the so-called Lungren amendment, calls for making voluntary agencies "legally and financially" responsible for the refugees they resettle in the U.S.

Proposed as an attempt to reduce welfare dependency among refugees, the amendment is strongly supported by the Reagan administration, which sees the measure as a way of reducing costs and strengthening the private sector role in domestic refugee affairs.

Volags, on the other hand, are in opposition; they charge that such an amendment would make them excessively liable for situations beyond their control, is an unfair indictment of current resettlement practices, and would severely alter the "voluntary" character of their work.

States such as California have voiced concerns, too. However, according to sources, the Lungren amendment could have ramifications beyond the current debate. Reportedly, areas that could be affected by those ramifications are federal financial support of the refugee program and U.S. refugee admissions.

"Legally and Financially" the Crux Although the controversy over the Lungren amendment has just recently heated up, the measure has been around for several months. In November, it was adopted by the House as part of legislation that would reauthorize the Refugee Act of 1980 (see Refugee Reports, Vol. IV, No. 24) after being introduced by Rep. Dan Lungren (R-Cal.).

The amendment, which stretches the period for all volag responsibilities for newly arriving refugees from 30 days to 90 days, anticipates an increase, too, in the grants that agencies would receive under their resettlement contracts with the State Department, and would take effect six months after passage by Congress.

IN THIS ISSUE:

An amendment that could have a significant impact on the U.S. refugee program—the "Lungren amendment"—is the subject of this issue's feature story.

Listing of pending legislation.......................4

- Recent Developments

Push-offs of boat people cause death, implicate Thai authorities, and raise questions about anti-piracy program; Salvadoran case could set precedent....................5

- Update

Cooperative agreements extended; White House demographic study reportedly considers immigrants; resource center closed..................7

- Resources ..............7

- Statistics ..............8
Such provisions, however, are not the crux of the current debate. That lies in the fact that the amendment would make volags "legally and financially responsible for the care of refugees" under their federal contracts. Also, according to a House Judiciary committee report, a "system of sanctions" would be developed and imposed if volags fail to satisfy the responsibilities the amendment outlines in the areas of food, clothing, shelter, and employment services.

Reduction in Welfare Spending Foreseen

Though it would not bar refugees from assistance, the amendment would foster a reduction in their welfare dependency in two ways, according to the House committee report: under the threat of sanctions, volags would be forced to discourage refugees from using the welfare system; and, due to a "close communication" between volags and welfare offices stimulated by the amendment, some refugees would be disqualified from welfare once the assistance they receive from volags is taken into account.

Apparently, the Reagan administration is convinced that the Lungren amendment would save federal dollars. For example, according to the FY 85 budget request that was recently submitted by the administration, federal spending on cash and medical assistance to states would be cut $96 million next fiscal year on the condition that new volag responsibilities such as those mandated by the Lungren amendment are forthcoming. Also, $15 million in Department of Health and Human Services refugee funds would be allocated to the State Department to "enable voluntary agencies to concentrate an intense effort during a refugee's crucial first 90 days...in this country," budget justification language states.

However, State Department spokesman Frank Sieverts said that it remained to be decided if and how that $15 million would be spent, though he indicated, too, that State's FY 85 budget request, which was unavailable at press time, reflects a $50 increase in all per capita amounts volags would receive for resettling refugees under agency contracts with State.

Agency Lawyers Say No

Depending upon one's position on the Lungren amendment, the proposal is seen as either lifting some control or imposing too much of it with regard to efforts to get newly arrived refugees self-sufficient.

"We've had testimony from volags, and all ask for more leeway in doing their jobs," a spokesman for Lungren commented. "This amendment," he said, "is consistent with the need for that leeway."

Nonetheless, lawyers for agencies have advised that the amendment grants volags nothing but opportunities to put themselves at risk.

For example, according to one legal advisement submitted in January, though the reduction of welfare dependency is a commendable goal, under the Lungren amendment "it should not be used to justify exposing volags to unknown and potentially unlimited liability."

As an illustration, it was noted that food, telephone, and furniture bills would be volag responsibilities "without regard for their total amount." Furthermore, according to the advisement, "in the event that a refugee is not covered by Medicaid or other health insurance or Medicaid is not retroactive and a refugee experiences an illness," the Lungren amendment would make the volag "liable for those medical expenses."

According to some assessments, such advice could convince voluntary agencies to withdraw from resettlement if the Lungren amendment passes. However, sources with the Office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and the Office of Management and Budget, the two leading proponents of the amendment, discounted that possibility.

"The volags are going to do what they have to do," commented Assistant Coordinator Richard Krieger, referring to the sense of obligation he said he believed existed among agencies with regard to resettlement. "They are not going to shirk their history (of resettlement) because of a law that is passed."

CWS Survey Bolsters Support For Current Approaches

Other volag sources, however, indicated that more is standing between volags and agency support for the Lungren amendment than legal advice.

Church World Service, for example, noted that the amendment would dramatically change the nature of resettlement and dis-
courage it because sponsorship of refugees would assume a legal, rather than a voluntary character.

More substantially, CWS released the findings of a survey late last month that bolsters the agency's contention that current approaches to resettlement are working.

Conducted by CWS in collaboration with the Calculogic Corporation, the survey randomly examined 4,500 refugee cases from fiscal years 1980 to 1983.

Among other things, the survey finds that only 7 percent of the cases studied were using full cash assistance three years after their arrival in the U.S.

In light of the survey's results, CWS stated that "there is no evidence of any significant long-term welfare dependency among refugees," and added that "it is unrealistic to determine the success of the refugee programs based on a 90-day or even a one-year adjustment period.".

California Has Other Concerns Though not as supportive of current resettlement practices as volags, state sources who were contacted expressed concerns over the Lungren amendment nonetheless.

In California, the state with the most refugees, refugee coordinator Anthony Smith explained that his state could be supportive of the Lungren measure, provided that it is strongly enforced.

"The pivotal issue is how much teeth it is going to have," Smith said. "We can agree with the logic of it, but we want it made clear that volags are held responsible for living up to their contract obligations" in order to prevent refugees from having to draw ultimately from state funded assistance programs.

Substantial Changes in Federal Support and Admissions Could Come Early in February, the Senate faced considering the Lungren amendment as part of its work on reauthorizing the Refugee Act. The key senator in the discussions was reported to be Alan K. Simpson, chairman of the subcommittee on Immigration and Refugees. Simpson was described as having a commitment "in principle" to the Lungren amendment, though it was not clear how his commitment would translate into action.

Meanwhile, Krieger of the Coordinator's office indicated that some room for negotiation on the amendment existed as far as the administration was concerned, as he hinted that his office could support dropping the word "legally" from the wording of the measure if the term caused a "hullabaloo."

Nonetheless, support for the measure generally remained intact and, according to sources, the amendment is simply serving as a preliminary move by the administration to deny new arrivals federally reimbursed assistance altogether.

A source with the Department of Health and Human Services reported that the HHS Office of General Counsel is studying the Lungren amendment and, specifically, how in-kind support by volags would affect refugees' eligibility for welfare under the measure. However, the source also said that HHS was examining the steps that would be necessary to withhold federally reimbursed assistance to refugees the first 90 days they are in the U.S. Reportedly, a major step would have to be amending the Social Security Act.

"One would lead to the other," the HHS source said, speaking of how the Lungren amendment has precipitated thinking about the complete cutting of federal support to new arrivals.

Additionally, the Lungren amendment was being discussed as a measure that could foster a rollback in another significant area--refugee admissions. Rumors circulated early this month that the administration was threatening to cut admissions if the measure is defeated.

Krieger denied those rumors, but indicated that the coordinator's office is going to give some extra thought to refugee admissions if the Lungren amendment dies. "...if Lungren does not pass, we would have to re-examine the (admission) numbers," Krieger said.

At press time, more news about the implications of the Lungren amendment was expected to be forthcoming at a White House meeting on February 9. The coordinator's office arranged the meeting and reportedly requested attendance by the heads of voluntary agencies and their board chairmen.
The following bills were introduced in the 98th Congress, First Session, from January 3, 1983, to November 18, 1983. Sponsors' names, party affiliations, and states are indicated. If there are several co-sponsors, they are indicated by "and others" after identifying the primary sponsor. The Immigration and Nationality Act is referred to as the "INA." The bills have been referred to the Senate or House Judiciary Committees unless another committee is indicated in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 25</td>
<td>Annunzio (D-Ill.) and others</td>
<td>To amend the INA to clarify the status of individuals who have been granted asylum</td>
<td>H.R. 3729</td>
<td>Mazzoli (D-Ky.) and others</td>
<td>&quot;Refugee Assistance Extension Act of 1983.&quot; To amend the INA to extend for two years the authorization of appropriations for refugee assistance, and for other purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1510</td>
<td>Mazzoli (D-Ky.) and others</td>
<td>&quot;Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1983.&quot; To revise and reform the INA, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>H.R. 4447</td>
<td>Moakley (D-Mass.)</td>
<td>To provide for the temporary suspension of deportation for certain aliens who are citizens of El Salvador, and to provide for a presidential and congressional review of conditions in El Salvador. (Foreign Relations, Judiciary, Rules).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1990</td>
<td>P. Burton (D-Calif.)</td>
<td>To amend the INA to provide special preference treatment for certain children born in the Philippines fathered by American servicemen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2035</td>
<td>Sensenbrenner (R-Wis.) and others</td>
<td>To amend the INA to change the numerical limitations on admission of permanent residents and refugees to the U.S., to deter illegal employment of aliens, and for other purposes. (Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, Rules, and Ways and Means).</td>
<td>S. 529</td>
<td>Simpson (R-Wyo.)</td>
<td>&quot;Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1983.&quot; To revise and reform the INA, and for other purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2304</td>
<td>McCollum (R-Fla.) and Shaw (R-Fla.)</td>
<td>To amend the INA respecting powers and procedures in immigration emergencies, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>S. 867</td>
<td>Benten (D-Tex.)</td>
<td>To authorize assistance to schools impacted by economic dislocations and legal alien immigration along borders of the U.S. and Mexico. (Labor and Human Resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2356</td>
<td>McCollum (R-Fla.) and others</td>
<td>To amend the INA to provide for a U.S. Immigration Court, to reform adjudication procedures and asylum, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>S. 1725</td>
<td>Hawkins (R-Fla.)</td>
<td>To amend the INA respecting powers and procedures in immigration emergencies, and for other purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2195</td>
<td>Mazzoli (D-Ky.)</td>
<td>To amend the INA to extend for 3 years the authorization of appropriations for refugee assistance.</td>
<td>S. 1983</td>
<td>Chiles (D-Fla.)</td>
<td>To amend the INA to provide special authorities and procedures for the control of immigration emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 3666</td>
<td>Jacob (D-Ind.)</td>
<td>To require that funds allocated for military assistance for El Salvador or for the rebels in Nicaragua be used instead by the INS to prevent illegal immigration from Central America. (Foreign Affairs, Judiciary).</td>
<td>S. 2131</td>
<td>DeConcini (D-Ariz.)</td>
<td>To provide for the temporary suspension of deportation for certain aliens who are citizens of El Salvador, and to provide for a presidential and congressional review of conditions in El Salvador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huddleston (D-Ky.)</td>
<td>To revise and refom the INA to create a ceiling on legal immigration to the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recent Developments**

**PUSH-OFFS OF BOAT PEOPLE LEAD TO DEATHS, ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THAI FORCES**

Thai authorities are believed to have assisted in at least two "push-offs" of boat people from the coast of Thailand that have resulted in the deaths of at least 25 persons and the abductions of six others.

According to well-informed sources in Bangkok, Washington, and Geneva who requested anonymity, the push-off that brought the greatest loss of life occurred on January 11 in the district of Tak Bai.

In this incident, sources said, local authorities in Tak Bai instigated the loading of a group of 72 Vietnamese who had been in Thailand for some days into two boats.

Thai Marine Police reportedly towed one boat out to sea that eventually landed safely in Malaysia.

However, 23 persons aboard the second boat drowned after being rammed by a fishing trawler that had been towing them. Sources said it wasn't known whether the ramming was deliberate.

During another push-off in December, sources reported that the Royal Thai Navy towed and then abandoned a group of 29 Sino-Khmer who had escaped from Cambodia and landed on the island of Kho Khut off of the Thai province of Trat.

Sources said that survivors' accounts indicated that pirates attacked the abandoned boat twice and abducted six women as the boat drifted for two weeks because of engine failure; also, during that two-week period, two children died of dehydration.

**Push-offs Not New** Thailand is considered to have tacitly supported push-offs for some time. In 1983, some 16 were reported to have taken place from Thai shores, primarily from the provinces of Narathiwat and Trat.

Generally, the push-offs are believed to have been non-violent and the direct actions of local authorities outside of the control of Bangkok. However, the reports of the incidents over the last two months are viewed as serious, not only because of the loss of life involved, but because of the alleged direct assistance by forces of the Thai government.

Admission of Thai involvement has reportedly been forthcoming already.

The January 30 Bangkok World contains comments by a Thai Navy spokesman who denied Navy involvement in push-offs, but said that Thai Marine Police stationed in Songkhla, Thailand had towed a refugee boat in January.

The spokesman is said to have indicated that the towing was in keeping with Thailand's overall policy of "humane deterrence" under which seaworthy refugee boats are provisioned but ultimately moved along to other countries, primarily Malaysia.

Nonetheless, the news of the push-offs triggered substantial concern.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Poul Hartling told a meeting of his executive committee in Geneva late last month that his office had been disturbed by "continuing reports...regarding the towing out to sea of asylum seekers under circumstances exposing them to grave physical dangers."

Afterwards, Hartling notified Thailand requesting an investigation into the incidents; such an investigation has since been undertaken personally by Thai national security chief Prasong who was reported to have gone to southern Thailand in early February in order to look into the push-offs.

The UNHCR is awaiting the outcome of the investigation before it comments further. Some observers, however, are skeptical about the investigation as they note Thai defensiveness about the push-offs and Thailand's record of conducting similar investigations in the past and producing few results.

**Doubts About Anti-Piracy Program** The news of the deaths of the boat people and the alleged involvement of Thai authorities also raised doubts about another matter—the internationally funded, $2.6 million anti-piracy program. In theory, the program is comprised largely of surveillance activities by the Thai Navy primarily, with lesser roles reserved for the Marine Police and other forces within Thailand.
That program has been under fire for its lack of convictions, but such criticism has always been blunted by arguments about the limited equipment it has provided the Thai, and the challenges Thai forces face in patrolling the high seas for pirates.

Those arguments have not been convincing to some, however. For example, the Netherlands, once a program donor, eventually withdrew its support because it considered the anti-piracy program ineffective.

On the other hand, the U.S., the largest contributor to the anti-piracy effort, reportedly remains steadfast in its support, even in light of the news of the recent push-offs. Congress recently voted $10 million for anti-piracy activities to be spent over the next two fiscal years, and State Department sources have indicated that most of the $5 million slated for this fiscal year will be spent for Thai administered activities that again call for significant involvement by the Thai Navy and Marine Police.

Donor nations are reported to be meeting in Geneva at the end of this month to consider future funding of the program, and, according to sources, the news of the recent push-offs could chill donor interest. At press time, it wasn't known if the meeting would be held before the Thai had an opportunity to report on the outcome of the investigation into the push-offs.

The case, Escobar and Sanchez, concerns two Salvadorans appealing for asylum based on their fear of persecution because of their membership in a "particular social group."

Specifically, the petitioners have argued that "young, urban working class males, who have never served in the military and who have never overtly expressed support of the Salvadoran government," constitute a legally recognized social group subject to persecution.

Under the Refugee Act of 1980, a refugee is one who has a "well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."

According to the Salvadorans' lawyers, these are some of the major points at issue in the appeal: what constitutes a social group; whether young, working class men can be considered a legally recognized group; whether this group is being persecuted; and, whether mere membership in the group makes one subject to persecution.

Also, the board, which heard the appeal on January 16, will decide whether an individual fear of persecution must also be shown in asylum cases involving group persecution.

At a congressional hearing on February 6, Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, deplored the reports of the push-offs and reportedly indicated that they could have serious repercussions on U.S. aid to Thailand.

APPEAL IN SALVADORAN CASE COULD SET LEGAL PRECEDENT

A case pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals could set legal precedent for interpretations of the definition of a refugee under U.S. law with major immediate impact on certain Salvadoran asylum seekers.

The case, Escobar and Sanchez, concerns two Salvadorans appealing for asylum based on their fear of persecution because of their membership in a "particular social group."

Specifically, the petitioners have argued that "young, urban working class males, who have never served in the military and who have never overtly expressed support of the Salvadoran government," constitute a legally recognized social group subject to persecution.

Under the Refugee Act of 1980, a refugee is one who has a "well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."

According to the Salvadorans' lawyers, these are some of the major points at issue in the appeal: what constitutes a social group; whether young, working class men can be considered a legally recognized group; whether this group is being persecuted; and, whether mere membership in the group makes one subject to persecution.

Also, the board, which heard the appeal on January 16, will decide whether an individual fear of persecution must also be shown in asylum cases involving group persecution.

Appeal is Consequence of 1982 Ruling

According to the January 20 issue of Interpreter Releases, the appeal stems from a ruling in 1982 that denied the Salvadorans asylum on the grounds that "young, working class males" was a classification so broad as to "render the definition of 'refugee' meaningless."

A favorable decision in Escobar and Sanchez could set a significant precedent for persecution claims by persons who may be arbitrarily labeled subversive because of their occupation or membership in a social group, explained attorney Amit Pandya of the ACLU Political Asylum Project.

Pandya added that statistics presented by the Salvadorans' lawyers and the government on the size of the "particular social group" in the case were widely disparate, ranging from 30,000 to 200,000.

The appeal also has significance for international law, as the international and the U.S. definitions of a refugee are the same, UNHCR legal assistant John Tenhula
explained. Consequently, he said, UNHCR is paying close attention to the case.

UNHCR's interest in the case also derives from the fact that it recognized the two Salvadorans as refugees under a policy that did not take into account whether an individual had fully exercised all rights to apply for asylum in a host country. That policy has since been changed to one under which refugee status may be reviewed only after those rights have been exhausted.

Update

- A White House study on future demographic shifts in the U.S. population reportedly indicates that the federal government may one day be interested in depending upon immigrants in order to maintain an all-volunteer military force. According to the Washington Post, the study indicates that immigrant interest in the military may be keen because: "(The immigrants) might find military wages and benefits more attractive than lower-paying civilian jobs."

The White House study, which is described as an internal document prepared for the Cabinet Council on Economic Affairs, is also said to have found that legal and illegal immigration account for one-third of the U.S. population increase yearly. It is also reported as having concluded that increased federal funds will be needed to serve the younger and proportionately larger immigrant populations in the areas of English as a Second Language training and expanded day-care programs.

- Cooperative Agreements between voluntary agencies and the State Department Bureau for Refugee Programs have been extended until February 29, 1984. State and volag officials are currently negotiating changes in language and reporting requirements under the agreements.

- The Refugee Resource Center of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies closed operations as of January. Established in 1981 as an information and research project of ACVA's Committee on Migration and Refugee Affairs, the center's contract with the State Department was not renewed for 1984. An announcement about the closing is expected soon from ACVA which will indicate if the resource center's projects will be continued by other staff.

In response to a story on lead poisoning that appeared in Vol. IV No. 22, a reader writes that the milder symptoms of lead poisoning are: pallor, fatigue, malaise, anorexia, irritability, fitful sleep patterns, sudden behavioral change, and developmental regression. More serious are ataxia, clumsiness, weakness, abdominal pain, persistent vomiting, constipation, and changes in consciousness.

Also, Vol. IV, No. 16 has an erroneous figure for the U.S. refugee ceiling for FY82 on page two. The correct figure is 140,000. Lastly, on page five of the Vol. IV special issue (December 16, 1983), the second entry for the chart "Refugees and Asylum-Seekers Resettled by Country 1975-1981" should read "East Asia": the chart that appears at the bottom of the same page, though reproduced correctly from a U.S. State Department document, has been found erroneous by State. A correct version is unavailable.

Resources

REPORT ON PIRACY RELEASED

"Vietnamese Boat People: Pirates' Vulnerable Prey", a report on attacks against boat people by Thai pirates, has just been published by the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

Based upon site visits by USCR staff to Thailand and Malaysia, the report outlines the piracy problem in detail and makes recommendations for improving a situation that has resulted in countless deaths of refugees. It concludes that the United States, the United Nations, and Thailand, among others, have not shown enough resolve in protecting boat people.

Copies of the report are available free from USCR by calling 202/667-0782, or by writing USCR, 815 15th St., NW, Suite 610, Washington, D.C. 20005.
## Statistics

### INDOCHINESE REFUGEE ACTIVITY FOR FY 1984

**as of December 31, 1983**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES OF ASYLUM/RPCs, POPULATION</th>
<th>FY 84 ADDITIONS</th>
<th>FY 1984 REDUCTIONS</th>
<th>TRANSFER TO THIS MONTH'S RPCs</th>
<th>POPULATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARRIVALS*</td>
<td>TO U.S. 3RD COUNTRIES</td>
<td>VOL REPAT.</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
<td>13,462</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACAU</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>5,753</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>10,602</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>9,278</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOAT</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,304</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,467</strong></td>
<td><strong>957</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,489</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND - KHMER</td>
<td>62,206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND - HIGHLANDERS</td>
<td>48,562</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND - LAO</td>
<td>19,738</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND - VIETNAMESE</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LAND</strong></td>
<td><strong>131,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,605</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT (ODP)</strong></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6,049</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>3,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>176,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,612</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATAAN - RPC</td>
<td>15,787</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALANG - RPC</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHROM PHINSHI ESL/CD CENTER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RPCs</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,636</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,762</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**                      | 194,394         | 13,350             | 10,826     | 9,352   | 134   | 83    | 9,414     | 189,477**

* Includes births except for figures from Thailand - UNHCR Thailand does not report births or deaths.

† Voluntary relocation of Khmer to the Thai/Kampuchean border.

** The end-of-month population figure is provided by the UNHCR and is the result of ongoing updating and adjusting of statistics.

** SOURCE:** Department of State - RP/RAP (primary source - UNHCR)

---
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THIRTY PERCENT CUT IN DOMESTIC REFUGEE FUNDS REQUESTED BY THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION

Federal funding of domestic refugee and entrant assistance would be cut by nearly a third next fiscal year under spending proposals forwarded by the Reagan administration this month.

Specifically, the U.S. refugee budget would drop from its current level of $514.6 million annually, to $359.5 in FY 85.

The bulk of that drop would stem from decreases in federally reimbursed cash and medical assistance to states. Once again, such funds are a major portion of the overall budget.

And, once again, most federal refugee funds would be directed to California. The state with the most refugees, California alone would receive about 42 percent of the federal refugee budget.

A sizeable cut would also occur in the special targeted assistance funds for localities with concentrations of refugees.

Yet, some current funding levels would remain the same under the administration proposals, and some would increase.

For example, federal dollars for a matching grant program with voluntary agencies would be retained at the level of $4 million. To account primarily for inflation, spending on social services would be raised $1.8 million to a total of $46.2 million; more significantly, funding of health programs would double.

May Be Lowest in Five Years The administration's budget request is for a program that has resettled some 300,000 refugees since 1980, the year the Refugee Act took effect. If approved, it would mark the lowest federal amount spent on refugees in five years.

Although the budget proposal assumes that this year's total refugee admission ceiling of 72,000 will be kept for FY 85, the government nonetheless estimates that caring for refugees already in the U.S., as well as new arrivals, will become less costly for several reasons.

Chief among them is that the number of "time eligible" refugees—or those persons who by virtue of
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SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FEDERAL REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE FOR FY 85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 84 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 85 Estimate</th>
<th>Increases/Decreases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Administered Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Assistance</td>
<td>$200,128,000</td>
<td>$147,645,000</td>
<td>$-52,483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>110,437,000</td>
<td>79,865,000</td>
<td>$-30,572,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administration</td>
<td>46,585,000</td>
<td>33,900,000</td>
<td>$-12,685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>357,150,000</td>
<td>261,410,000</td>
<td>$-95,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Services</strong></td>
<td>44,400,000</td>
<td>46,200,000</td>
<td>$+1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, State Adm. Programs</strong></td>
<td>401,550,000</td>
<td>307,610,000</td>
<td>$-93,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Assistance</strong></td>
<td>81,500,000</td>
<td>19,390,000</td>
<td>$-62,110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Children</td>
<td>16,600,000</td>
<td>12,976,000</td>
<td>$-3,624,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Health</td>
<td>4,400,000</td>
<td>8,891,000</td>
<td>$+4,491,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Agency Programs</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Administration</td>
<td>6,515,000</td>
<td>6,645,000</td>
<td>$+130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, Refugee &amp; Entrant Assistance budget authority</strong></td>
<td>$514,565,000</td>
<td>$359,512,000</td>
<td>$-155,053,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Department of Health and Human Services

When they arrived in the U.S., are eligible to receive federally reimbursed assistance—are expected to decline in number.

According to budget projections, the decline will be from 260,000 such refugees currently, to 186,000 next fiscal year, a drop-off expected to save $70.8 million.

Additionally, it is estimated that another $16 million would be saved because of a decrease in the rate of welfare dependency among refugees. Generally considered too high by Congress, it is anticipated that the rate will decrease from its current level of 53 percent to 49 percent in FY 85. The majority of cash assistance recipients would be receiving AFDC payments according to the government, while most of the refugees receiving medical assistance would be under Medicaid.

"...programs and initiatives to promote economic self-sufficiency" by the Office of Refugee Resettlement, as well as efforts "to discourage dependency on state welfare systems as a strategy for adjustment..." will account for the declining rate, states the federal budget justification.

...programs and initiatives to promote economic self-sufficiency by the Office of Refugee Resettlement, as well as efforts "to discourage dependency on state welfare systems as a strategy for adjustment..." will account for the declining rate, states the federal budget justification.

(The lead story in the last issue of Refugee Reports (Vol. IV, No. 1) may have given the impression that the proposed cuts in federal assistance are based solely on the assumption that a measure such as the Lungren amendment will be adopted. Such is not the case, though the administration budget request reflects support for "a policy in FY 85" that would give voluntary agencies greater responsibility for the refugees they resettle. To that end, $15 million of the proposed FY 85 refugee budget for the Department of Health and Human Services would be allocated to the State Department for use by agencies.)

Placement Policies Would Soften Targeted Assistance Decrease The 77 percent cut in targeted assistance program funds—from $81.5 million this fiscal year to $19.3 million in FY 85—is described as being in order for two reasons: the high level of previous funding for targeted assistance, and the placement policy initiatives by ORR that are expected to lessen the strain on communities with large refugee populations.

A smaller though significant cut would also occur in federal money for grants to school districts with large numbers of refugee and entrant students. According to the administration, approximately $135 million in such grants have been appropriated since 1980, but "given the reduced refugee..."
flows and the capacity already established to meet the educational needs of refugee children," the budget request for FY 85 of $12.9 million reflects a decrease of 22 percent from the current fiscal year.

Apparently reflecting past congressional concern over the conditions of arriving refugees, health care funds for refugees would double in FY 85. Much of the $8.8 million that is being requested for this area would be spent on having the Public Health Service administer some 66,700 health assessments to new arrivals and secondary migrants already in the U.S. Too, Southeast Asian refugees who are identified as being infected with tuberculosis and eligible for preventive treatment will be "started on therapy and followed up." A portion of the money for health care would also go towards overseas health screening.

In FY 85, a number of studies costing $1 million would also be conducted. About one-third of that amount would cover the costs of maintaining ORR's current data system, with the remainder slated for tracking economic self-sufficiency among refugees, producing statistics on refugee income levels, and studies of welfare dependency, case management practices, and the implementation of employment services standards. Also, a $150,000 study would be carried out to "study the pattern of Ethiopian refugee economic participation and adjustment" and the effects of Ethiopians' participation in ORR programs.

Lastly, $6.6 million would be spent on federal administration of the refugee program. As part of that funding, positions at ORR would be pared by four—from 90 to 86—and remaining staff would be paid an average annual salary of $40,500.

Update

Saying that "it is clearly evident that the allegations are not supported by the facts," Thailand's national security chief Prasong gave the results of his investigation into recent reports about "push-offs" of boat people from Thailand. Prasong spent two days earlier this month looking into reports and issued his findings at a February 8 press conference in Bangkok. According to him, the January 11 push off in which 23 refugees were alleged to have drowned after being rammed by a boat was instead a case of a refugee boat capsizing in waters outside of Thai territory. Additionally, Prasong said that a December incident that had been reported actually occurred in Cambodian waters and involved pirates and vessels that were not Thai. He also disputed accounts that a certain Thai vessel had repeatedly robbed refugee boats. The Thai security chief closed his report declaring that "the government and the people of Thailand are profoundly disappointed and deeply regret the public disclosure of unsubstantiated allegations" by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Legislation that would grant legal resident status to persons who arrived in the U.S. as part of the Cuban/Haitian boatlift of 1980 has been introduced by Peter Rodino (D-N.J.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Rodino introduced the measure February 9, stressing that he was particularly concerned about the "tragic plight" of Haitians. "No group in recent history has been subjected to more injustices by the Immigration Service," Rodino said. He added that his bill would also rectify an "unjust" policy that the Reagan administration is following by refusing visas to family members of the Cubans. Meanwhile, press reports indicate that the Reagan administration plans to offer status to the Cubans only.

Sen. Alan K. Simpson (R-Wyo.) wasn't quite prepared in mid-February to decide whether he'll support the Lungren amendment, according to a source close to the chairman of the Senate Immigration and Refugee subcommittee. The amendment would make voluntary agencies legally and financially responsible for the refugees they resettle. The source said the Wyoming senator, though committed "philosophically" to the amendment, wanted time to consider how it would apply "in specific situations" and to study volag allegations that it would make agencies excessively liable. At first, the source suggested that the senator would be turning to volags and the coordinator's office for his information, but later suggested that clarification was needed from Rep. Dan Lungren (R-Calif.).
himself over the ramifications of his amendment. The source added that another amendment to the legislation which would reauthorize the U.S. refugee program may also give Simpson pause. That amendment would allow all newly arriving refugees to receive one year of federally reimbursed medical assistance. The source said Simpson doesn't see such benefits "being given to poor Americans."

The FY 84 admissions ceiling of 50,000 for East Asian (Indochinese) refugees will be met according to State Department assistant secretary W. Tapley Bennett, Jr. Bennett made his prediction in a January 26 letter to Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. Solarz and 25 other members of Congress had proposed increasing the ceiling in order to alleviate their concern that Thailand may repatriate Cambodian refugees forcibly. The Thai government, the lawmakers said, had expected "a...more generous U.S. numerical commitment" to admissions, and could also be prompted to repatriate refugees because of a slowdown in processing. The congressmen indicated that 60 percent of the Indochinese who will be admitted in FY 84 were approved last year. Bennett replied by saying that the current ceiling would be reached because of new INS processing guidelines and Thailand's partial opening of some formerly closed refugee camps. However, he indicated that a lag in admitting recently approved refugees would continue.

Voluntary agencies "were not fully advised...nor...involved" in the formation of rules for placing refugees in the U.S. that have recently been proposed by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (see Refugee Reports, Vol. IV, No. 25). The American Council for Voluntary Agencies made that assessment in comments it submitted to ORR on the placement proposals February 7. Saying that the proposals are "unnecessary and inappropriate" because ORR is already permitted to restrict placement in impacted areas, ACVA also pointed out in that the placement rules would set a dangerous precedent by restricting freedom of movement, and also impose legal restrictions on the "voluntary response of the private sector to human needs." ACVA has not been the only opponent to the rules proposal, however. On December 18, the Orange County Register, a daily newspaper in one of the counties that would be considered impacted under the rules ORR is proposing, came out against the proposals in an editorial. Calling for ORR to "lay off the paternalism," the Register argued that "refugees have a better chance of becoming self-supporting where there is already a substantial community of similar ethnic background." At ORR, policy analyst David Howell said that it is still too early to say how comment on the proposals would affect their consideration by ORR. All comment was due at the agency on February 10.

Uncertainty over the level of refugee social services funds has caused program disruptions in employment services according to sources. Under the second continuing spending resolution that Congress passed last November, social services money for FY 84 was cut from $57.5 million to $44.4 million, largely through the initiative of the Office of Management and Budget. Reportedly, OMB acted on the basis that less funds were appropriate because of declining refugee admissions to the U.S. However, in mid-February, the Office of Refugee Resettlement was attempting to channel a portion of its targeted assistance funds to social services programs in order to make up for the reduction. Meanwhile, cash flow problems stemming from the cuts and the general uncertainty over this year's social service funding are being felt. In Ohio, which has a county administered refugee program that does not allow for the provision of services with only the promise of reimbursement, the disruptions are said to be severe. Gail McCulloch of Traveler's Aid of Cincinnati, a service provider, reported that an employment program for 300 adult refugees in the greater Cincinnati area would be reduced until the funding picture comes clear. In McCulloch's opinion, the precipitous timing of the cutback, rather than the cutback itself, is the problem. "If it had been done more logically, it could have been handled," she said. (The Federal Register for February 13 contains ORR's proposals for allocating FY 84 social services funds. Consult pp. 5383-5385 for details.)
AMERICAN PROGRAM

TOTAL DEPARTURES FROM VIETNAM AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>MONTH/YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL U.S. IMMIGRANT NON-IMMIGRANT HUMANITARIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENS REFUGEES VISA VISA* PAROLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 82</td>
<td>September 1982</td>
<td>12 11 -- -- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FY82</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 11 -- -- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 83</td>
<td>October 1982</td>
<td>27 24 3 -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1982</td>
<td>2 2 -- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 1982</td>
<td>22 10 3 5 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 1983</td>
<td>46 20 14 9 3 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 1983</td>
<td>-- -- -- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 1983</td>
<td>73 8 43 20 2 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 1983</td>
<td>93 5 83 5 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1983</td>
<td>61 2 58 1 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1983</td>
<td>73 2 68 3 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1983</td>
<td>77 4 69 2 2 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 1983</td>
<td>58 1 55 2 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 1983</td>
<td>106 3 98 5 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL FY83</td>
<td>638 81 494 52 10 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 84</td>
<td>October 1983</td>
<td>-- -- -- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1983</td>
<td>88 -- 79 7 2 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 1983</td>
<td>78 1 69 8 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL FY84 AS OF 12/31</td>
<td>166 1 148 15 2 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMERASIAN DEPARTURES AS OF 12/31/83</td>
<td>816 93 642 67 12 2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† In addition to the Amerasian cases listed, a total of 896 relatives of Amerasians entered the U.S. as of December 31, 1983: 811 as refugees, 61 on immigrant visas, 13 on non-immigrant visas, and 11 on humanitarian parole.

* Includes Amerasian children of non-married mothers.

† No flights departed Vietnam this month.

SOURCE: Bureau for Refugee Programs

Resources

SURVEY ON RESETTLEMENT AVAILABLE

"Making It on Their Own," a survey on refugee resettlement in the U.S., has been released by Church World Service. The survey, which includes all refugees resettled through CWS programs from 1980 through early 1983, concludes that "there is no evidence of any significant longterm welfare dependency among refugees."

According to the survey, only 7 percent of refugees were found to be on public assistance after three years. CWS also found a declining unemployment rate among refugees over time "from 47 percent among 1983 arrivals to 14 percent among 1980 arrivals, and a private sector contribution to resettlement during that period of $133 million."

For a free summary or to order a copy of the complete 140-page survey ($3.00), write Church World Service, 475 Riverside Dr., New York, NY 10015.

DOCUMENTATION CENTER FOR ATTORNEYS ESTABLISHED

The ACLU Political Asylum Project has inaugurated a documentation center on Salvadoran human rights that is intended primarily for use by asylum attorneys.

Accessed by microcomputer (database management program dBASE II), 1500 materials currently comprise the "documents file", which ranges broadly.

A separate "victims file" contains the names and fates of 18,000 victims of human rights violations culled from independent human rights sources in El Salvador and from sources such as Amnesty International.

"Key words" to facilitate access of information and should be requested before soliciting information.

For further details contact: Maria Boza, ACLU Political Asylum Project, 122 Maryland Ave., NE, Washington, DC 20002. (202) 543-4651.
LAW GUIDE FOR NEWCOMERS

Intended for use by intermediate and advanced ESL classes, Law in Your Life: A Newcomers Guide to Everyday Law (1983) is a 46-page manual prepared by Project LEARN (Legal Education and Assistance for Russian newcomers) and funded by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

Although the manual was developed for use by Russian refugees, it has wider applicability for ESL students. It covers such practical legal matters as individual rights and civil liberties, making and breaking a contract, and rights and obligations of rentors.

The manual contains 12 lessons in all, each consisting of a narrative dialogue that is followed by vocabulary, discussion questions, and points of grammar.

Contact: Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, Project LEARN-ESL Order, 130 E. 59th St., Rm. 617, New York, NY 10022. Cost: $2.50 each or $2.00/10 copies or more.

MINORITY JOURNALISM SCHOLARSHIPS OFFERED

Applications from minority students for scholarships for broadcast journalism for Fall 1984 are being accepted by the School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Minnesota.

The scholarships are awarded annually to four outstanding minority students who are either entering their junior year or are studying for a Master of Arts degree in journalism at the university.

Applicants are required to be U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens. Transfer students are also considered.

For applications, write Linda W. Vienmeister, WCCO Program Coordinator, School of Journalism and Mass Communication, 111 Murphy Hall, 206 Church St., S.E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

FREE MEDICARE HANDBOOK AVAILABLE

A Spanish-language edition of Your Medicare Handbook is now available. The booklet, which details eligibility requirements as well as the extent of coverage under the Medicare program, is a reference for counselors.

The publication, SSA Publication No. 05-10950, is available free from: Health Care Financing Administration, Social Security Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C. 20201.

COURSE OFFERED TO INDOCHINESE REFUGEE WORKERS

A six week course for Indochinese refugee resettlement workers will be offered next month on general and mental health issues in refugee affairs.

The stresses of resettlement, cultural values and beliefs of the Indochinese, and appropriate methods of crisis intervention will be among the topics of the course, which begins March 19.

New and experienced refugee workers are invited to register by mid-March with Betsy Dane, School of Social Work--Continuing Education Program, Hunter College, 129 E. 79th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021 (212) 570-5037. Registration fee is: $90.

TECHNIQUES IN TEACHING ESL

Oxford University Press recently advertised several new texts for teachers of ESL at all levels. The methodology series includes Techniques in Teaching Vocabulary by Virginia French Allen ($4.95), Techniques in Writing by Ann Raimes ($5.95), and Techniques in Testing by Harold S. Masden ($4.95).

Forthcoming in the series are Techniques in Pronunciation by Joan Morley and Techniques and Methods by Diane Larsen-Freeman. The latter publication will discuss principles behind the eight most commonly used language teaching method.

To request these books or for information on other titles, write: English Language Teaching Department, Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016 (212) 697-7300.
American Streamline Connections is a new text for intermediate level English language instruction suitable for adults. Using conversations, narratives, short stories, magazine and newspaper articles, Connections emphasizes speaking and listening skills in a fully illustrated, color text. Connections also takes a cumulative approach to grammar and vocabulary.

In addition to the student text ($5.50), a teachers' edition ($10.95), two cassettes ($19.95), and two workbooks ($5.50) are available. Class discounts are also offered. For information, contact Oxford University Press, English Language Teaching Department, 200 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016.

Khmer-American Health is a new bilingual newsletter on Khmer health issues. Published quarterly by Khmer Health Advocates, the newsletter is for distribution to Khmer across the country as well as to other interested parties.

Khmer Health Advocates, a non-profit organization which provides health education and advocacy for locally-resettled Khmer, also is compiling a bibliography on Khmer health issues and refugee experiences.

To request a free subscription or to submit articles for publication in the newsletter, contact Khmer Health Advocates, P.O. Box 14703, Barry Square Office Hartford, CT 06114.

Subscription Order Form

Please check the appropriate box:

☐ Basic Rate $75.00 for one subscription.
☐ Multiple-copy Rate $50.00 each for 2 or more subscriptions sent to the same addressee.
☐ Special Multiple-copy Rate $50.00 each for 10 or more subscriptions requested at the same time.

You coordinate the request—we will mail copies to individual addressees, anywhere (overseas postage not included).

CHECK(S) SHOULD BE MADE PAYABLE TO REFUGEE REPORTS SUBSCRIPTIONS

Mail subscription order form and check(s) to:
Refugee Reports Subscriptions, 20 West 40th Street, New York, NY 10018

Name: ____________________________ Affiliation: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
City: ____________________________ State: ____________ Zip Code: ______

Foreign subscribers (other than Canada and Mexico) add $24.00 for postage.

Check your renewal date on your mailing label and renew your subscription promptly.
## Proposed FY 85 Federal Funds to States for Refugee and Entrant Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 83 Actual</th>
<th>FY 84 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 85 Estimate</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 83 Actual</th>
<th>FY 84 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 85 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$ 703,000</td>
<td>$ 620,000</td>
<td>$ 433,000</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$ 1,360,000</td>
<td>$ 1,199,000</td>
<td>$ 838,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1,549,000</td>
<td>1,366,000</td>
<td>954,000</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>494,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>606,000</td>
<td>534,000</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>245,157,000</td>
<td>216,443,000</td>
<td>151,221,000</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>13,083,000</td>
<td>11,534,000</td>
<td>8,058,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>245,157,000</td>
<td>216,443,000</td>
<td>151,221,000</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,456,000</td>
<td>1,284,000</td>
<td>897,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6,424,000</td>
<td>5,663,000</td>
<td>3,957,000</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>30,545,000</td>
<td>26,929,000</td>
<td>18,814,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>4,617,000</td>
<td>4,070,000</td>
<td>2,844,000</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,780,000</td>
<td>1,569,000</td>
<td>1,096,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>741,000</td>
<td>517,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>8,053,000</td>
<td>6,497,000</td>
<td>4,539,000</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3,269,000</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>2,014,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>48,636,000</td>
<td>42,876,000</td>
<td>29,957,000</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
<td>2,539,000</td>
<td>1,774,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4,955,000</td>
<td>4,368,000</td>
<td>3,052,000</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>17,815,000</td>
<td>15,706,000</td>
<td>10,973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>16,331,000</td>
<td>14,398,000</td>
<td>10,059,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>4,564,000</td>
<td>3,203,000</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>692,000</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>426,000</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>5,487,000</td>
<td>4,837,000</td>
<td>3,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>22,519,000</td>
<td>19,853,000</td>
<td>13,871,000</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>814,000</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>501,000</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>322,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4,633,000</td>
<td>4,084,000</td>
<td>2,854,000</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>824,000</td>
<td>726,000</td>
<td>508,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>6,725,000</td>
<td>5,929,000</td>
<td>4,142,000</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>13,807,000</td>
<td>12,172,000</td>
<td>9,804,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>912,000</td>
<td>638,000</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>4,551,000</td>
<td>4,012,000</td>
<td>2,803,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3,017,000</td>
<td>2,660,000</td>
<td>1,858,000</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>422,000</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>678,000</td>
<td>598,000</td>
<td>418,000</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>13,057,000</td>
<td>11,511,000</td>
<td>8,043,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5,179,000</td>
<td>4,566,000</td>
<td>3,190,000</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>25,979,000</td>
<td>22,903,000</td>
<td>16,002,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>17,272,000</td>
<td>15,227,000</td>
<td>10,639,000</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8,208,000</td>
<td>7,236,000</td>
<td>5,056,000</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>5,686,000</td>
<td>5,013,000</td>
<td>3,502,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>21,237,000</td>
<td>18,723,000</td>
<td>13,081,000</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>137,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>323,000</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2,115,000</td>
<td>508,000</td>
<td>359,512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>727,000</td>
<td>508,000</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2,115,000</td>
<td>508,000</td>
<td>359,512,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Department of Health and Human Services
DECLINE IN FLOWS OF SOVIET JEWS CONTINUES

A story is told about the emigration of Soviet Jewish refugees.

Two officials, one American, the other, Soviet, are talking.

"You know," the American says to the Russian, "it is difficult to tell how many refugees are going to be coming out under your emigration program."

"You can't tell?" says the Russian.

"No," says the American. "From month to month, year to year, it is hard for us to know."

"In that case," says the Russian, "our program is working."

Although the story is old, it is still true according to sources. The emigration of Soviet Jews is at a low point and there is only speculation as to the reasons for the decline and when it may be reversed.

Eighty-eight Jews arrived in Austria in January, the third-lowest monthly total in a year. In 1983, only 1,314 Jews left the Soviet Union according to the National Conference on Soviet Jewry (NCSJ), the smallest annual total in thirteen years.

U.S. refugee admissions reflect the tightened emigration picture. Most of the refugees arriving under the Soviet Jewish/Eastern European admissions ceiling of 12,000 are Poles, a departure from the past when Jews predominated and had, in fact, an admissions ceiling of their own. Meanwhile, the State Department says it is prepared to raise the admissions ceiling if the emigration picture accelerates.

Yet, the emigration has only slowed in recent years and consequently, there is apprehension. For example, Jewish organizations worldwide plan to set aside March 15 as an "International Day of Concern For Soviet Jews." When they do, they will be drawing attention to refugees who are considered "brothers and sisters" by American Jewish communities, and "singular" in their ability to adapt well to life in the U.S.

Visa Applicants Dubbed "Parasites" Persecuted for their refusal to assimilate, approximately one-tenth of the two million Jews in the Soviet Union have applied for exit visas according to sources. Many
more are said to favor emigrating but are afraid to express their interest in leaving.

"How many Jews want to come out? All of them," says NCSJ spokesman Robin Saipe.

Reportedly, the Jews fear for good reason. The very act of applying for a visa is considered traitorous. Thus, applicants are often fired from their jobs, and are then subject to being jailed on the grounds that they are "parasites" of the state. Meanwhile, the application process can take months or years, impeded by bureaucratic red tape and problems such as non-delivery of mail to would-be refugees.

The Soviets grant exit visas only to Jews and on one condition—that they go to immediate family members who wish to "repatriate" in Israel at the invitation of relatives. The repatriation premise is said to have been adopted in order to prevent other dissatisfied minorities from having a basis for leaving Russia.

Refugees' Destination Has Changed

For a time, the Jews did go to Israel. In the 1983 World Refugee Survey, Abraham Karlikow reported that only 4.2 percent of the refugees departing the USSR ten years ago chose a destination other than the Jewish state, once they got out of the Soviet Union. Refugees started making different choices in later years, however; since 1975, over 60 percent of the 159,000 Jews who have left Russia have come to the U.S.

Sources dismiss the change in destinations as the reason for the overall decline in emigration. "They [the USSR] may use it as an excuse, but we find it hard to believe," said one source with the U.S. Jewish community, who maintained that Soviet-supported Arab states are happy that underpopulated Israel has not been receiving the refugees.

Instead, even with the downturn in emigration, the altered resettlement pattern appears to be considered more serious because of how it has strained relations between Israeli and American Jewish resettlement organizations.

Jewish leaders in the U.S. say that they would prefer that the refugees repatriate in Israel, but they also feel compelled to support giving Soviet Jews a choice about their destinations.

Lured by the general image of the U.S. as the "land of the free," the refugees are also said to have opted for America for specific reasons that include interest in having greater social and economic opportunity and safety from war. According to Karl Zukerman of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the organization that assists in the resettlement of most of the Soviet Jews who have arrived in the U.S., there is another motivation, too.

"Almost everyone who has been coming in the last three years," Zukerman explains, "has arrived for reasons of family reunification."

For its part, the U.S. has stayed out of the discussion of the destination question, saying that it concerns itself only with the validity of the Jews' claims for refugee status. Those claims have been well-received—virtually all of the Jews who have applied for refugee status from the U.S. have been approved.

According to one U.S. source, the status has been granted easily "even though it is
acknowledged that some Jews are not direct targets of persecution." "They're not individually persecuted...because...[they can't] practice Judaism," the source explained. "[And they can't practice their faith because they are] under a communist system."

"Jews are refugees in the truest sense," states Gary Rubin of the American Jewish Committee (AJC). Referring to the difficulties Jews face in the Soviet Union, Rubin discounts notions that they are favored simply because they live in a communist country or because Jews have strong advocates in the U.S.

Noting that the AJC has a "broad refugee concern," Rubin adds that his organization and other Jewish groups advocate for refugees besides Soviet Jews.

Well Adjusted in the U.S

The controversy that has surrounded the flows of Soviet Jews to the U.S. notwithstanding, agreement exists on how the refugees have fared once they are in America.

They have done well, sources say, partly because of their background. The findings of researchers Rita and Julian Simon are said to be typical: "The majority of Soviet immigrants who have arrived in the U.S. within the last decade are well-educated, technically skilled, cosmopolitan people who are ambitious about their work and careers, and have high expectations about their eventual position in American society," the Simons concluded in their study of 900 Soviet Jewish families who arrived in the U.S. between 1972 and 1980.

The pair found, too, that the refugees they examined were well on their way to turning their dreams into reality; 83 percent of the men and 75 percent of the women who were surveyed were in the labor force in 1980.

Other factors have contributed to the Jews' adjustment. Many come speaking English, and virtually all are welcomed by communities of fellow Jews who greet the refugees first "with a hug and a kiss," according to Joel Carp of the Jewish Federation of Chicago. "The second thing we do," Carp says, "is tell them that they have to get a job."

The programmatic version of that welcome is a matching grant arrangement under which private agencies match $1,000 in federal funds to pay for the cost of resettling each refugee for six months. Services are "front-loaded" and reportedly supplemented by agency contributions that exceed the amounts required by the grant.

Carp claims that the approach has been outstanding in making the Jews self-sufficient and could be applied to other refugee groups who use welfare more. Using 1982 statistics to illustrate, he said that only 338 out of a possible 2500 Soviet Jews were drawing state assistance in Illinois approximately a year ago.

Despite such statistics, however, Carp added that it is not necessarily easy to resettle the refugees. "You cannot imagine how hard it is for Soviet Jews to adjust...," he says, referring to the mistrust of bureaucracies, including those belonging to volags, that he said he had seen in the 7500 Jews who have come to Chicago. "You can't imagine how ingrained the terror is."

Soviet Jews A "High Priority" to Reagan

Because of the squeeze in emigration, Carp and other agencies are not receiving the refugees they once were. At one time, as many as 200 refugees a month were being seen by the federation, but it is currently considered lucky if such a figure is an annual sum.

From President Reagan on down, administration sources say that they are doing their best to stimulate emigration. "The issue of Soviet Jewry has been and will continue to be of high priority to this administration," Reagan wrote the NCSJ last month.

Generally, sources in the Jewish community say that they believe Reagan, but there is some concern that the coolness between the U.S. and Russia in recent years has helped to bring about the low numbers of departing Jews.

U.S. officials say, however, that such concern is unwarranted. "The downturn in emigration began before [Reagan] took office," commented one administration source. The source also added that it was too soon to speculate about how the recent change in Soviet leadership would affect matters.

For the Jews still in the Soviet Union, waiting for an upturn in emigration policy may be getting tougher. Already, sources
say, there are signs that a renewed campaign against Jews is underway. According to a January report by the NCSJ, steps have been taken recently within the Soviet Union to curb educational and cultural opportunities for Jews and to restrict emigration laws even further.

"Jews," the report states, "...are being portrayed as potential traitors and refused the benefits of conformity--or the ability to leave."

Recent Developments

CUBAN/HAITIAN BILL VIEWED AS SOLUTION FOR ALL

The Reagan administration may have been "let off the hook" by proposed legislation that would adjust the status of Cubans and Haitians, most of whom arrived in the U.S. during the 1980 boatlifts, according to sources.

The legislation, H.R. 4853, was introduced by Rep. Peter W. Rodino (D-N.J.) on February 9. The measure is considered a potential solution to the uncertain status of both groups should the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform legislation, which provides for the adjustments, fail to pass Congress.

Rodino's bill has gained the support of many in Congress and in the Cuban and Haitian communities. The administration reportedly has no serious objections to the measure, though it would "prefer the Simpson-Mazzoli approach," according to Immigration and Naturalization Service congressional liaison Greg Leo.

However, at about the time that Rodino unveiled his proposal, the New York Times reported that INS and Justice Department lawyers planned to adjust the status of Cubans only. According to the newspaper, administration officials saw the basis for their plans in the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966, a law which they were reported to consider inapplicable to the Haitians.

The paper also quoted Commissioner Alan Nelson as saying that INS was considering such plans because of unexpected delays in the passage of Simpson-Mazzoli.

Report of Plan Termed Premature Since the story appeared, INS officials have maintained that it was premature. However, other sources have indicated to Refugee Reports that INS was in fact planning to adjust the Cubans alone because an impending lawsuit by the Cubans may well have resulted in their adjustment under a court order. Additionally, opponents of the "Cuban only" approach have reportedly charged that the administration was also preparing to adjust the Cubans because of its interest in attracting Hispanic votes in an election year.

Sources added that ensuing criticism over the press report caused INS to back away from its plans.

Part of that criticism came from the media. For example, referring to INS' reported plans, the Miami Herald questioned whether the Haitians were left out "simply because they are poor and black and fled the poverty of a right-wing dictatorship instead of the deprivations of communism." The New York Times called the possible action "a new unfairness...because of a quirk of law."

The actual number of Cubans and Haitians who would be affected by the Rodino bill is unknown.

Sources indicate that some Cubans and Haitians have already become permanent residents by virtue of their having U.S. spouses, close relatives, or professional certification. However, it is estimated that the measure would apply to 90,000 of the 125,000 Cubans who came in 1980, and about 30,000 Haitians who arrived prior to January 1, 1982.

STATE AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FORGE NEW "COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT"

A new cooperative agreement between the State Department and voluntary agencies for resettling refugees in the U.S. took effect March 1.

The agreement, which provides agencies with federal resettlement funds, was struck after two months of negotiations between State and volags during which agencies raised a number of concerns.

As part of that negotiation, a proposed requirement for non-federal contributions to resettlement was deleted from the agree-
Volags had objected to the stipulation because they considered it contrary to the voluntary nature of the private sector, according to Don Hohl of the U.S. Catholic Conference.

Explicit rules barring the volags from obtaining other federal funds for resettlement services during the period of the agreement were also deleted.

However, unallowable expenses previously defined by State Department auditors were retained in the agreement. They include prohibitions against travel on foreign carriers, entertainment expenses, and using interest accrued with agreement funds for non-resettlement expenses.

Increases Provided Under the new agreement, the fixed per capita grant for volag services during the 90-day initial resettlement period has been increased to $390 for European refugees and $560 for all others. Volags with reserves from prior funding will continue to receive the FY 83 rate of $365 and $525, respectively, until their reserves are exhausted. Currently, only two volags have reserves according to State's Norman Runkles.

While grant levels under the agreement were not in contention during the negotiation, USCC representative Hohl indicated that volags would like to see one grant amount for all refugees. "Volag expenses are basically the same [for Europeans and non-Europeans]," he explained. Also, Hohl said that "if anything, that amount should be an increase [over present levels]," as, in his opinion, the $500 rate per refugee allotted to volags in 1975 has not been adequately adjusted for inflation.

Runkles agreed that it was probably no longer valid to have different grant levels since European and non-European refugees alike have communities that are supportive of them. Initially, the variance in funding was established because the Indochinese were arriving to find themselves without the benefit of such communities and, consequently, officials believed that they would require more expensive care.

Runkles added that consideration is being given using a single grant level next fiscal year.

The new agreement will expire September 30, 1984.

ORR CONSULTATION FOCUSES ON LUNGRON AMENDMENT

The Lungren amendment addresses a California refugee problem that is not shared by other regions of the U.S.

Such is the finding of participants who attended an Office of Refugee Resettlement consultation in Atlanta late last month. The session was the first in a series of consultations that will be held over the next several months in order to meet requirements under the Refugee Act of 1980.

According to ORR Region IV Director Suanne Brooks, participants at the consultation, who included representatives from a cross-section of the refugee field, found that the Lungren amendment (see Refugee Reports, Vol. V, No. 1) "seems to [reflect] the reverse of our experience with refugee cash and medical assistance."

Brooks explained that southeastern states do not have a problem with refugees being dependent on welfare, saying that refugees there tend to receive assistance for four to six months only on average.

Brooks added that a year ago, 1300 refugees received public assistance in her region whereas currently there are just 350.

Greater employment opportunities and low welfare payments were cited as the reasons for the low usage and the decline, and Brooks said that refugees who do not want to work move to states outside the region.

However, she said, too, that migration to the Southeast exceeded migration from the area because of the lure of jobs and refugee services.

Update

- Aliens who are apprehended attempting to enter the U.S. illegally are not protected by the U.S. Constitution, according to a ruling by the U.S. 11th Circuit Court of Appeals on February 28. The ruling came in the federal government appeal of a lower court decision that had found that the rights of Haitians had been violated when the Immigration and Naturalization Service held them in detention camps. The decision
was hailed as an "important victory" in the government's attempt to control immigration by INS Commissioner Alan Nelson. Nelson told a press conference in Washington, D.C., March 1, that the finding by the 11th Circuit not only gives the government the right to make immigration decisions based on nationality in cases involving the detention and parole of excludable aliens, but also frees it from having to inform every alien who attempts to enter the U.S. that he has a right to apply for asylum. However, criticism, too, was directed at the court decision. "We find it really hard to believe that the Haitians are not considered persons under the terms of the Constitution," Rev. Gerard Jean-Juste of the Haitian Refugee Center in Miami told the Washington Post.

The emphasis that the Reagan administration wants to give to sending relief aid to Central America became the topic of discussion during a hearing before the House International Operations Subcommittee on February 27. State Department Bureau for Refugee Programs Director James Purcell testified that the administration wanted $14.7 million restored to its budget for this fiscal year--the money had been cut under a congressional spending resolution--and a similar amount for FY 85, largely to cover the cost of relief. However, those requests brought questions from Daniel Mica (D-Fla.), the new subcommittee chairman, who said that the administration spending plans were unrepresentative of the emphasis that had been given to relief for the region by the Kissinger Commission Report on Central America. At the conclusion of the hearing, Mica suggested that even if a hearing is not held on the bill soon, the Roybal legislation could still serve as a source of amendments to the Simpson-Mazzoli bill.

On February 22, Rep. Edward R. Roybal (D-Calif.) introduced an immigration reform bill with the support of the Hispanic Caucus that is considered an alternative to the Simpson-Mazzoli bill. Immediately referred to the Judiciary Committee, the Immigration Reform Act of 1984 (H.R. 4909) most notably differs from Simpson-Mazzoli in that it omits employer sanctions for hiring illegal aliens and emphasizes enforcement measures by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Labor Department. It would also establish a four-year commission to study illegal immigration. The measure has 25 co-sponsors, and supporters indicate that even if a hearing is not held on the bill soon, the Roybal legislation could still serve as a source of amendments to the Simpson-Mazzoli bill.

Projects and Programs

INS SAYS CHANGES COMING WITH OR WITHOUT SIMPSON-MAZZOLI

While Immigration and Naturalization Service officials may be disappointed if the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform legislation fails to pass Congress, sources indicate that preparations for the legislation have sparked improvement within the service that will prove beneficial in the long run. For example, Associate Executive Commissioner Doris Meissner said that contrary to public perception, INS has not been gearing up solely for a legalization program as called for by Simpson-Mazzoli. According to her, plans for addressing illegal immigration have also been drawn that include speeding asylum determinations and adjudications, increasing border enforcement, and raiding workplaces. Concomitant plans for an agency-wide automation of records have also been read-
ied, she said, explaining that 10 percent of INS' FY 84 budget of $500 million will pay for the computerization.

Over One Million Spent in One Year  Iron-}

ically, it appears as though the planning that has been directed strictly to reforms called for by Simpson-Mazzoli has had and may continue to have a harder time bearing fruit.

According to INS official Jack Shaw, "easily over a million dollars" was spent last fiscal year by a task force that had been set up to study the legalization of millions of aliens.

With many fitful starts and stops during debate over the bill, the INS task force had to revise its legalization plan several times. However, according to former Deputy Commissioner Gerald R. Riso, the current plan is flexible enough to reflect the development of a bill by Congress without undergoing substantial modifications.

Though the details of the plan are not public information, Shaw outlined some of its basics.

Upon enactment of a reform bill, INS would require 90 days to implement changes. The plan includes contracting an advertising agency to conduct an information campaign in Spanish and other languages for aliens, and contracting voluntary agencies to provide counseling and assistance to aliens either in INS "in-take" centers or in private facilities.

INS' task force has already started canvassing retired and former INS personnel to make up a pool of 1100-1500 temporary legalization workers who would process applications and interview aliens. Nearly 100 INS centers in pre-determined locations across the country are planned; highly impacted cities such as Los Angeles may have as many as 12 processing locations. Nationwide, offices are expected to process between 25 and 150 applications daily.

Although the participation of volags in legalization is considered key, meetings between INS and agencies have suggested that volag participation is not a given.

According to Jim Hoffman of the U.S. Catholic Conference, INS has approached agencies with a set and inflexible plan that the volags had no part in drafting. Arnoldo Torres of the League of United Latin American Citizens noted that "noon meeting of the minds or resolution of issues" has taken place between INS and private groups over implementing a legalization program.

Whether such a program will be required may be known soon, as the Simpson-Mazzoli bill could be debated on the House floor this month.

Resources

ASSIMILATION OF CUBANS THE SUBJECT OF A SPECIAL

A special double issue of Migration Today (XI, No. 4/5, 1983) provides a comprehensive review of research on Cuban refugee flows, highlighting accounts of the 1980 boatlift, attitudes and expectations of the entrants shortly after arrival, the difficulties of resettling Marielitos compared to earlier Cuban refugees, and hindrances to the effective bilingual delivery of mental health services to Cubans.

The special issue is available for $5.75 (includes postage and handling) from Migration Today, 209 Flagg Place, Staten Island, NY 10304. (212) 351-8800.

CONDITIONS INSIDE VIETNAM HIGHLIGHTED

"Special Report: Violations of Human Rights in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, April 30, 1975 to April 30, 1983" by Ginetta Sagan and Stephen Denney, was produced under the auspices of the Aurora Foundation. Based upon interviews with 500 Vietnamese refugees over a period of four years, the report provides a detailed look at the repression of ethnic Chinese, whom the "Hanoi government sought to eliminate...for ideological and practical reasons"; religious persecution of all sects; and conditions in 150 reeducation camps and prisons which have incarcerated over one million Vietnamese since April 1975 and currently hold "at least 60,000 people."

Copies of the 46-page report are available for $2, plus postage, from Aurora Foundation, 177 Toyon Rd., Atherton, CA 94025.
# Statistics

**ASYLUM CASES FILED WITH DISTRICT DIRECTOR FOR FY 84 CUMULATIVE**

As of January, 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY</th>
<th>Cumulative Received This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Granted This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Denied This FY</th>
<th>Pending End of Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9177</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>6415</td>
<td>161,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA (MAINLAND)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTA RICA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>115,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>2322</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>11,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY-G.D.R.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUAM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRENADA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONDURAS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>8542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nationalities with fewer than 10 applications pending are omitted from this chart

**Other than Hong Kong**

---
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Refugee admissions of the same size and scope as this fiscal year, as well as a continued emphasis on overseas assistance are major features of the State Department's refugee budget proposal for FY 85.

The budget plan, which was submitted last month, calls for spending a total of $341.4 million next fiscal year, or $3.8 million more than State requested for FY 84 (see chart p. 2).

The proposal is a good indicator of where the Reagan administration wants to head with the foreign side of the nation's refugee program in the long run.

However, consideration of another budget item may have the most immediate impact on refugee programming.

That item, an FY 84 supplemental funding request that is attached to State's spending plans for next fiscal year, asks for increased relief aid to Central America and other areas.

The request has already run into trouble in Congress, and administration sources indicate that if it is not granted, funds would have to be raised by reducing other aspects of the current program, possibly even refugee admissions, in order to meet aid requirements this fiscal year.

Indochinese Numbers Left Alone  "In a departure from our practice in the past several years, we are not proposing a reduction in refugees [from Southeast Asia]," James Purcell, director of State's Bureau for Refugee Programs, told Congress in recent testimony on his bureau's FY 85 budget proposal.

According to Purcell, reductions would not occur in other areas, either, as admissions ceilings would total 72,000 and reflect those established during the FY 84 administration consultations with Congress.

Purcell said that a reduction of the 50,000 ceiling for Southeast Asia had been ruled out in light of "higher than anticipated camp populations." Those populations, he explained, stemmed from "processing difficulties" that had slowed admissions last year.
The bureau chief also said that the move to maintain admissions of Indochinese refugees had also been sparked by administration interest in demonstrating American resolve in refugee matters.

Despite the U.S. commitment, the State Department estimates that there will be an "average population" of 120,000 persons in first-asylum camps of Southeast Asia next fiscal year, and another 20,000 in processing.

As of February, camp populations totaled 163,000, while another 23,000 refugees were being processed.

Processing "Carryover" Anticipated During a hearing before the Senate Foreign Operations subcommittee on March 7, Mark O. Hatfield asked how processing in Southeast Asia would proceed under State's FY 85 budget plans.

Purcell projected that 28,000 of the 50,000 Indochinese admissions to the U.S. next fiscal year would be "carried over" from FY 84. Explaining that the prospect of the carryover reflects the need to give refugees overseas training, the department director added that any refugee who is going to enter the U.S. this fiscal year would have to be approved by April 1.

Responding to other questioning by Hatfield, Purcell also denied that the U.S. planned to end its refugee program in Southeast Asia; however, he observed that the program "as we know it" would be substantially smaller after FY 85 if current rates of refugee arrivals and departures continue.

State also hopes the Orderly Departure Program will lessen the need for a large Indochinese refugee program. ODP, which provides for legal exits from Vietnam, has been expanding. For example, approximately 8,000 persons exited via ODP for the U.S. in 1983, twice the number of the previous year.
However, Hatfield indicated during the hearing that he has problems with ODP. "I'd like to see a refugee program that is not predicated on corruption," the senator from Oregon said, referring to the bribes that are said to be required of Vietnamese who wish to use ODP.

Purcell agreed that a "substantial amount of corruption" marks the program, but he said that State hoped that the corruption could be "avoided" in the future.

Such hope may be difficult to realize. For example, a private source with recent experience inside Vietnam shared Hatfield's concerns.

Describing ODP as a program that is essentially open to ethnic Chinese only, the source noted that Vietnam has excluded ex-reeducation camp internees from exiting legally.

"Certainly, ODP is not an alternative to illegal departures," the source declared, saying that declines in illegal escapes reflect boat shortages and restrictions on travel inside Vietnam, rather than fewer would-be refugees.

Overseas Assistance the Major Focus Although funds for admissions within the FY 85 budget would increase from $106 million to $117.2 million, assistance would remain the focal point of State's spending.

Such assistance would account, for example, for 57 percent of total spending by the bureau. Though State's actual dollar amounts for foreign aid would decline, the decrease primarily reflects the fact that the Agency for International Development is expected to fund assistance activities in FY 85 that are currently supported by the State Department, such as aiding displaced persons in El Salvador.

In addressing the needs of a world refugee population that the U.S. estimates to be 7 million, State would spend most of its assistance request--$93 million--on the Near East where, budget documentation notes, "Afghan refugees continue to be the single largest group of refugees...."

U.S. aid to that region would meet approximately one-third of the total cost of caring for refugees there.

American assistance would also cover a similar proportion of the costs in other areas and for the following amounts: $54.5 million would go to Africa where "at least 24 nations" are extending asylum to 2 million refugees; $33.8 million would be spent on Southeast Asia to care for 195,000 refugees in UNHCR camps, and 230,000 on the Thai/Cambodian border, and also to pay for the cost of admitting some 12,000 persons as refugees and 3,000 as immigrants under the ODP; and $15 million would be funnelled to Latin America, which is described as a region where "needs are continuing to increase due to continued strife...."

House Panel Says No to Supplemental Speaking of those needs, Purcell defended his bureau's request for supplemental funding for this year before the House International Operations Subcommittee in late February. The request totals $14.7 million, almost half of which would be for displaced persons in El Salvador.

With subcommittee chairman Daniel Mica (D-Fla.) indicating his belief that not only the supplemental request but also State's FY 85 assistance figures were too low, the House panel eventually rejected the bid as unjustified.

Reportedly, the supplemental request can still be accepted by the Senate and eventually approved by Congress. However, if it fails, Purcell noted that State would be forced to consider reductions in current refugee programming in order to meet its FY 84 assistance requirements.

Apparently, State Department officials are prepared to cut refugee admissions, albeit reluctantly. "We are going to try to avoid that at all costs," bureau budget analyst Rozanne Oliver told Refugee Reports.

Grants to Volags Would Increase The discussion over the supplemental notwithstanding, State believes that more staff are needed next fiscal year to manage its assistance funds as well as to address other areas.

The department's FY 85 budget proposal would increase the refugee bureau's current roster of 97 positions by seven, two of which would track the activities of voluntary agencies.

"This office has seen its workload double in the past two-and-a-half years as more stringent requirements are levied on..."
the resettlement agencies," the budget justification states. "In spite of their substantial overtime, the present staff is unable to complete the number of field reviews of reception and placement that is required."

Volag activities would receive more than additional staff, however. Under the FY 85 budget proposal, a grant level of $410 for the resettlement of Soviet and Eastern European refugees, and $585 for all other refugee groups would be available to volags through their funding arrangements with the State Department.

The next stop in the budget process is expected to be House Appropriations in late March. In recent years Congress has failed to actually appropriate refugee funds, choosing instead to provide money under a continuing spending resolution. While such a resolution can be adopted according to several formulas, lawmakers have usually opted to accept either the president's request or the previous fiscal year's spending level, whichever was lower.

Recent Developments

OVER FIFTY LIVES MAY HAVE BEEN LOST IN PIRACY ATTACK

Lam Thi Thanh Xuan and Chiem Thi Ly are lucky.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the two girls, ages 10 and 12, survived a piracy attack that may have taken the lives of over 50 Vietnamese boat people.

The incident reportedly involved a boat that carried 60 passengers who departed Vietnam late last month.

The second day that the vessel was at sea, five pirate boats attacked it. The Vietnamese were robbed, according to UNHCR, and two women were raped.

A second attack occurred the next day, when nine pirate boats reportedly converged on the boat people. Twenty women were abducted, and the remaining passengers were thrown overboard.

Thanh Xuan and Ly, whose accounts are said to be the basis for the attack reports, were described as having been rescued by a Malaysian fishing boat. The pirates had kidnapped the girls along with the others, raped them, and eventually tossed them overboard, too.

The fates of 52 of the other boat people who had set out with the girls were unknown in early March.

According to the Bangkok World, the incident was termed the most "horrible" to have occurred in February, according to the UNHCR when the international organization reported earlier this month on recent piracy activity.

News of it also prompted the U.S. Committee for Refugees in Washington, D.C., a non-profit, public information group on refugee affairs, to urge its constituency to contact President Ronald Reagan and members of Congress asking them to provide leadership in bringing the piracy problem to a halt.

The World reported that UNHCR indicated that "dozens" of boat people were "robbed, battered, and dumped into the sea" at the hands of pirates last month.

According UNHCR's own publication, Refugees, some 1400 persons have been killed, 2300 raped, and another 600, all women, abducted and never found since 1980 because of the piracy.

"These are the known cases," UNHCR adds in its February issue.

Prasong Criticizes Funding However, developments with respect to piracy have not been confined simply to the water in recent weeks.

On March 8, Thai Security Chief Prasong Sunsiri reportedly told UNHCR that the current international fund for the Thai administered, internationally funded anti-piracy program--some $2.6 million--was "chicken-feed". Apparently referring to recent disagreements between Thailand and UNHCR over alleged "push-offs" of boat people from Thai shores, Prasong is said to have declared that his government would reject continuance of the fund if it were going to be used by UNHCR to "make Thailand look like a criminal."

A meeting of donor countries to consider the future of the fund had been scheduled for early March but was postponed at last report because of "technical problems," according to UNHCR spokesman Nicholas van Praag. The aid is due to run out this June.
Prasong also announced that all refugees at Panat Nikhom transit camp, including boat people, would be moved to camps on the Thai/Cambodian border if they have been rejected for resettlement. Prasong is said to have indicated that his government would soon conduct a survey of camp populations to determine the number of refugees who should be transferred.

AMERICAN MONITORING OF SALVADORAN RETURNEES RAISED AT CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

U.S. monitoring of Salvadorans who are returned to El Salvador by American immigration officials became a topic of discussion during a congressional hearing on March 13. In recent years, the U.S. has returned over 20,000 Salvadorans as illegals, and opponents of the deportations have charged that the practice subjects returnees to persecution.

In the hearing, which was held before the Senate subcommittee on Immigration and Refugees to consider FY 84 funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, INS Commissioner Alan Nelson testified that the U.S. "has no information or proof that there are problems with people being returned to El Salvador." Nelson, responding to questioning by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), added that interest groups concerned about the welfare of returnees have been unable thus far to "back up their positions" that the deported Salvadorans face persecution.

"Is it a study or something that was done ad hoc?" Kennedy asked the commissioner after Nelson implied that the U.S. position rested on findings gathered by an unnamed State Department official. At first, Nelson responded that a "study" of returnees had been done, but later said that the results stemmed from a "survey".

The answer appeared to be greeted skeptically by Kennedy--he requested access to the findings--and later drew criticism from at least one interest group.

Proof of Persecution Said to be "Red Herring" American Civil Liberties Union spokesman Amit Pandya observed that Nelson's response echoed previous administration rebuttals that claim that American officials have no evidence that people are being persecuted "because they have been returned from the U.S."

"When a requirement is that specific," Pandya said, "it is impossible to prove under current conditions in El Salvador."

Pandya also said that the U.S. is in the best position of any party to follow returnees, but has not been serious about doing so.

Such concerns notwithstanding, the ACLU spokesman said that the whole discussion about proving persecution was a "red herring" being used by the administration to block support for granting Salvadorans extended voluntary departure status. That status would allow the Central Americans to remain temporarily in the U.S., and according to Pandya, it has been granted before to other groups who have not had to prove the likelihood of persecution for returnees.

During the hearing, Nelson testified that EVD was not favored by the administration, which views the status as "discretionary...and not only humanitarian" in scope, but also tied to foreign policy considerations. "One must also consider the immigration concerns," the commissioner added, as he said that granting EVD would draw "hundreds of thousands, millions..." of Salvadorans to the U.S.

However, the administration would be bound to grant EVD if H.R. 4447 becomes law. The measure, which grants the status, had gained over 100 House sponsors, and it was expected to receive a hearing in April before the House subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law.

Some asylum statistics also came out of the March 13 hearing. Officials indicated that INS hopes to clear its asylum backlog by the end of FY 84, which was described as being comprised of 166,000 pending applications. It was explained that approximately 125,000 of those applications "can be subtracted out" from the total of pending asylum bids, since that sub-total reflects Cubans and Haitians who arrived in 1980 boatlifts and are expected to be legalized. INS officials explained that the
remaining applications plus 40,000 more that the service expects to receive this fiscal year would be processed by the end of September.

Nelson also testified that apprehensions of illegals on the U.S./Mexican border "continue to set new records almost every month." In the agency's Chula Vista sector, two daily apprehension records were set recently: on February 12, when 2,504 illegals were taken into custody, and on February 19, when 2,854 were caught.

Alan Eliason, who heads the border patrol for Chula Vista, a sector that receives 40 percent of border flow, also noted that "non-Mexican" arrests were up 60 percent in January and 90 percent last month. Eliason said that the largest number of non-Mexicans being arrested were Salvadorans, but that the patrol had also recently seen its "highest number of Guatemalans" yet.

Projects and Programs

THE SANCTUARY MOVEMENT--TWO YEARS OLD AND GROWING ACCORDING TO ORGANIZERS

Although the sanctuary movement is aimed at stopping American intervention in Central America, its most publicized and immediate impact has been in harboring illegal aliens in the U.S., "victims of violence," according to movement organizers.

Congregations that have declared sanctuary have justified their actions on biblical and historical grounds. Participants cite Exodus, Psalms, medieval canon law, the pilgrims' flight to America and the Civil War's underground railroad as examples of a tradition that they say they are following.

Almost half of the 100 sanctuaries are Protestant churches, another 21 are Catholic, 16 are Quaker meeting houses, and one is a synagogue. Additionally, more than one thousand other churches and synagogues are said to endorse sanctuary.

Altogether, between 500 and 1000 Salvadorans and Guatemalans have been sheltered by the movement since it began two years ago.

For these Central Americans, sanctuary is not simply a place to hide. For them, the movement serves, among other things, as a forum for speaking publicly about conditions in their homelands.

"Juan," for example, a Salvadoran in Illinois, averages 15 appearances monthly before church and community groups.

In an interview with Refugee Reports, Juan said he left El Salvador following an Army raid that left 50 killed, and came to the U.S. to convince the churches to help end American military aid to his country. To Juan and to members of the sanctuary movement, the aid fuels the civil conflict in El Salvador.

Difficult for Movement Members, Too

Yet, though life is difficult for those who receive sanctuary, it can also be trying for members of the movement. According to sources, the decision by members to engage in civil disobedience by harboring illegals means risking fines and imprisonment.

For at least one provider of sanctuary, the risk does not seem unusual. "By accepting the Salvadorans, we are doing what comes naturally in our faith," commented John Steinbruck, pastor of Luther Place Memorial Church in Washington, D.C. Steinbruck's church has sheltered Washington's homeless since 1972. He asked, "Why make a distinction between the homeless of the world?"

To some observers, however, distinctions are needed.

For instance, Richard Feen, a special consultant to the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and graduate of Harvard Divinity School, challenged the theological arguments of the movement.

"The sanctuary movement is using refugees to make political points," Feen said, "...theologically speaking, this is wrong." Other Reagan administration officials have described sanctuary as undermining immigration laws and public attitudes about aliens.

Nonetheless, sanctuary proponents believe their actions are justified.

"Only by trying to stop the war...can we end the need for food, clothing and protection [of refugees] here," maintained Robin Semer, sanctuary coordinator from the Chicago Religious Task Force.

Recent encounters with federal officials have the sanctuary leaders concerned, even
though the Immigration and Naturalization Service contends that it does not have a concerted anti-sanctuary policy.

Last month, for example, an INS raid of the movement's "underground railroad" in Texas netted three Salvadorans, a Dallas reporter, and two American organizers. The Americans are currently being investigated by a grand jury for alleged conspiracy to transport illegal aliens.

Interest in Sanctuary Said to be Growing

Despite the recent clashes with authorities, sanctuary sources say that their movement is growing at a rate of one to two new members weekly.

To date, organizers have concentrated simply on getting "grassroots" support for sanctuary. Yet, some participants have been active in ways aside from harboring aliens. For example, congregations have sent letters and petitions to Congress and to INS in support of "extended voluntary departure" for Salvadorans, a status that would allow the Central Americans to stay temporarily in the U.S.

Still others have sent delegations to Central America that have seen conditions first-hand and have reported back on the reasons for the refugees' flight and on risks faced by U.S.-deported Salvadorans upon return to their country.

"There have been just as many phone calls and requests for information," since the recent raids involving sanctuary members, according to coordinator Semer.

She added, "If the government persists in declaring the church people...as felons, and if the church continues in its role of aiding the refugees..., then there will have to be more confrontations down the road."

Meetings and Conferences

CONFERENCE SCHEDULED FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

"Successful Resettlement Strategies--Present and Future" is the theme of a conference scheduled for San Diego, California from June 7-9, 1984.

The conference, which is being sponsored by the San Diego Refugee Coalition in cooperation with the Office of Refugee Resettlement and the California Department of Social Services, will focus on resettlement policies and practices, and issues related to health, education, and employment.

To register early, send $35 by May 1 ($45 thereafter) to Refugees in the USA Conference, c/o Refugee Orientation and Employment Program, 733 Eighth Ave., San Diego, CA 92101. Accomodations and meals at the University of San Diego conference site are limited and cost $90 per person, double occupancy, for the three days.

Additional information is available by calling Mary Cahill (619) 560-3092 or Tai Doan (619) 230-2366.

Resources

U.S. LATIN AMERICAN REFUGEE POLICY QUESTIONED

"Latin American Refugees: Problems of Mass Migration and Mass Asylum" by Patricia Weiss Fagen is a study of recent U.S. policy issues concerning Salvadoran, Haitian, and Cuban refugees. The study, which appears in editor Richard Newfarmer's From Gunboats to Diplomacy: New U.S. Policies for Latin America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1984, 254 pp., $11.95), concludes that "neither U.S. nor humanitarian interests are served by policies designed to exclude indiscriminantly," and stresses negotiated political agreements and directed economic assistance to help curtail the flow of Latin American refugees. At the same time, Weiss Fagen recommends passage of a fair immigration reform, federal responsibility in Latin American refugee resettlement in the U.S., affording UNHCR a larger policy role in the U.S., and provision of extended voluntary departure to Salvadorans and possibly Guatemalans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YTD FY84</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YTD FY84</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>CIT.*</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>CIT.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>6026</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist of Columbia</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>7189</td>
<td>7496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Germany (Ped.Rep.)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saare</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Johnson Atoll</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>NC. Pariaha Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Miday Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Trust Territories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>born at sea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Wake Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR YTD FY84 19141

TOTAL FOR YTD FY84 19141 19141 19141

* Information in this report is based on documents from ACVA, ICM and other federal agencies available on the date of this report and may not include information on all refugees in the categories reported.

* Note: Children born in refugee camps are assigned citizenship of parents. Citizenship information is often lacking, especially for non-Southeast Asians.

SOURCE: Office of Refugee Resettlement.
COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY OF AID RECIPIENTS IN CALIFORNIA RELEASED

Large numbers of refugees who are "time-expired," many others who cannot speak English, and an unexpected number of refugee children who have been born in the U.S. are among some of the major findings of a survey of refugee cash assistance recipients in California.

The survey, the most comprehensive one ever done, was conducted last June. At the time, the state had 185,000 aid recipients, or 55 percent of the refugees who were receiving assistance nationwide.

According to California officials, the poll confirms many of their previous impressions about assistance users, and looms as a sign that "refugees are not coming to the U.S. prepared to assimilate."

Not all agree, however. According to a well-informed source in Washington, D.C., for example, more needs to be known about the survey's findings before any judgments can be made.

"It should not be used as a scare tactic," the source said of the survey.

Additionally, at least one State Department official suggested that the survey results should not serve as an indictment of the overseas training of refugees who are headed for the U.S., until the training background of the aid recipients is clear.

Typical Aid Recipient Vietnamese The study, "Refugees Receiving Cash Assistance Characteristics Survey," gathered data from 15 California counties and found a typical aid recipient to be Vietnamese, young, and poorly educated.

Half of the aided cases, the survey revealed, were intact families that were headed by someone with a record of previous employment. In most cases, the former employment turned out to be farming.

Additionally, about 75 percent of the refugees who were drawing assistance were enrolled in an AFDC program, and the average aid grant to a "cash assistance unit" of slightly more than three persons was $498. Many came to California from other states, notably Texas, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota.
Length of Time in California for Members of the Cash Assistance Unit

(As of June 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>All Aided Refugees</th>
<th>AFDC Refugees</th>
<th>RCA/GA Refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>184,845</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>168,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Born</td>
<td>19,039</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>18,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Calif. Born</td>
<td>165,806</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>149,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mo. or less</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12 mo.</td>
<td>17,874</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 24 mo.</td>
<td>42,118</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>37,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 36 mo.</td>
<td>46,542</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>43,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 or more</td>
<td>50,598</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>47,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Time in California</td>
<td>30.2 months</td>
<td>31.2 months</td>
<td>21.5 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Refugees Receiving Cash Assistance Characteristics Survey, California Department of Social Services, Dec. 1983

Specifically, about one-third of the aid recipients were secondary migrants, or persons who had established residency in other states. Another third had been assigned to a state other than California.

Time-Expired and Time-Eligible Nearly Equal

The most intriguing information in the survey may have to do with time-expired aid recipients, or refugees who had been in the U.S. long enough (over three years) to be ineligible for federally reimbursed assistance.

The study reports that over 40 percent of the refugees heading cash assistance units and who had initially resettled in California were time-expired, while a larger percentage of secondary migrants was ineligible for the federal funds. Almost equal percentages of time-expired and time-eligible assistance recipients were recorded (see chart above) among heads of AFDC units.

The survey percentages have California officials questioning expectations about the ability of refugees to achieve self-sufficiency, and the appropriateness of federal commitment to the matter.

"The theory that 36 months of funding from the federal government is adequate... [may not be correct]" commented state refugee coordinator Anthony Smith. "People are not moving off of aid as quickly as they need to."

Smith could not offer reasons for the significant number of time-expired refugees, but according to one outside observer who requested anonymity, at least one explanation is highly possible.

"It's likely that they are highlanders [Hmong]," the observer speculated, referring to an ethnic group that is considered hard to resettle and has moved to California's Central Valley by the thousands.

"If they are," the source continued, "that is one problem. If the time-expired cases are spread statewide, that's another, and you conceivably have a longer-term problem."

Birth Rate and Language Skills a Concern

Smith expressed other misgivings. He noted for example, that the survey indicates that aid recipients have born over 21,000 children in the U.S. California has the most refugees in the country--over 300,000 according to state officials and slightly less according to the Office of Refugee Resettlement. To Smith, the birth rate simply suggests "the magnitude of the [refugee] population we are dealing with."

He also took issue with survey figures about the language abilities of refugees. According to the survey, two-thirds of the persons who head cash assistance units in California are unable to communicate in English.

Smith explained that such a finding is disconcerting in that English skills are considered the "ticket item" to employment; California has devoted nearly one-third of
its current $15 million social services fund to teaching English to refugees.

Preparedness an Issue for California
Another California spokesperson, Jo Frederick of the Joint Legislative Committee on Refugees and Immigration, also voiced concern over the reported English abilities of aid recipients.

Frederick termed them "disturbing" and said that when they were combined with the survey's other findings--"96 percent of the aid cases had no resources...those given by the volags were exhausted"--the result is evidence that the "same old things" are prevailing in the nation's refugee program.

Refugees "are arriving unprepared for the labor market and needing longer than three years before they are competitive at finding jobs," she said.

Ironically, Frederick raised the preparedness question at a time when the overseas training of Southeast Asian refugees is reportedly hitting its stride. Preliminary indicators from a study that compares trained and untrained arrivals after six months in the U.S., for example, are said to be favorable. The results of the test should be available in less than a month.

Told of the comments coming from California, Ann Morgan, who directs training for the State Department, noted that "overseas training was never intended to replace" the need for domestic schooling but is viewed by State simply as a "head-start" for arriving refugees.

As for the assistance survey, Morgan explained that it could be reporting the circumstances of refugees who have never been trained, since the overseas program actually did not begin in earnest until two years ago. "Only 35 percent of the refugees who have been admitted to the U.S. since 1975 have undergone training," Morgan said.

Nonetheless, armed with the survey and the report of fact finding trip to Southeast Asia in 1983, California officials appear convinced that preparedness is a bona fide issue. Recently, Frederick's committee submitted recommendations to the various federal offices that call for a number of changes in the national refugee program, including requiring all approved refugees to pass an English proficiency test before they are admitted and disallowing family reunification unless family members in the U.S. are employed.

Frederick indicated that the recommendations were forwarded in March, but had failed to draw a response as yet.

* * * * *

Copies of the California assistance survey are available from the office of the state refugee coordinator. To obtain a survey, call the California Department of Social Services (916) 324-1576.

Recent Developments

PLANNED RELOCATION OF REFUGEES IN HONDURAS CRITICIZED

Plans to relocate Central American refugees from camps inside the Honduran border to areas deep within the country have raised concerns about the refugees' safety.

According to the Honduran government, some 10,000 refugees, mostly Salvadorans, will be transferred in August or September from western border camps to Olanchito, about 170 miles north. At a later date, approximately 8,000 more Salvadorans from the camp at Mesa Grande, which lies some 25 miles from the Honduran/Salvadoran border, will also be moved to Olanchito.

The Honduran government announced that the transfer was for the safety of the refugees; however, a Honduran military spokesman quoted by the Washington Post implied that the refugees were being moved because they were guerrilla sympathizers.

Whatever the case, the security of the refugees has been threatened in Honduras. Some have been abducted or killed by Salvadoran military personnel who reportedly make frequent incursions into Honduras as they search for Salvadoran guerrillas.

Given the situation and in keeping with its guidelines that call for removing refugees from dangerous border areas, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has been pushing for the relocation since 1980. Honduras reportedly resisted a more permanent move until this year because of long-standing rivalries between the two Central American nations.
Sealing the Border to Arrivals, One Concern

All are not convinced that moving the refugees will enhance their safety or that of future arrivals.

For example, Salvadoran refugees as well as voluntary agencies are reportedly protesting the move, claiming that the relocation is being considered simply to clear the border for U.S.-Honduran military maneuvers that could seal the area to arriving refugees in the future.

State Department spokesmen, however, deny any relationship between the refugee relocation and upcoming military exercises.

Also, volag personnel apparently place little stock in Honduran government assurances that UNHCR's four roving protection officers and refugee reception center on the Salvadoran border may remain to protect arrivals. In past incidents that have been confirmed by UNHCR, protection officers have been detained or prohibited from entering an area by military officers from Honduras, a non-signatory to the UN Convention and Protocol on Refugees.

Additionally, security at Olanchito is being questioned. Volag representatives note that land disputes there are pervasive and that the expulsion of Salvadorans from that area in 1969 led to a war between El Salvador and Honduras.

UNHCR spokesman Nicholas van Praag said his organization is concerned for the welfare of the refugees, but it has "taken extensive surveys" of the Olanchito site and found it sparsely populated and suitable for relocation.

"UNHCR is negotiating [with the Honduran government] on the logistics of the move and conditions [in Olanchito]," he said. "We don't want a concentration camp atmosphere with military guards everywhere, just enough to assure safety."

STUDY HIGHLIGHTS REFUGEE COMMUNITIES

Refugee communities provide crucial material and moral support to new arrivals, according to the findings of a recent study commissioned by the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Prepared by Christine R. Finnan and Rhonda Ann Cooperstein, the study, "South-east Asian Refugee Resettlement at the Local Level: The Role of the Ethnic Community and the Nature of Refugee Impact," is based upon interviews with refugees, refugee workers, and public and private service providers. The study examines several sites, including: Orange and San Francisco Counties, California; Orleans Parish, Louisiana; Sedgwick County, Kansas; and Monroe and Tompkins Counties, New York.

The study indicates that refugee communities provide social, spiritual, and personal support to ease resettlement pains. Also, larger refugee communities (over 10,000) are said to provide jobs in refugee businesses, loans, housing, and education services.

For these reasons, the study advises the federal government to direct resources toward leadership and business development among refugee groups and to promote the emergence of self-help organizations where there is no pre-existing refugee community.

Large Numbers Alone Not Necessarily Negative

As for other findings, the study also indicates that "large numbers of refugees or a high percentage of refugees in the population do not necessarily mean...large negative effects on the locality."

Rather, various factors are said to contribute to the impact of refugees on communities. For example, according to the study, "the rate of arrival of refugees appears to have as much of a negative impact on resettlement as the actual numbers residing in the locality."

Also, Finnan and Cooperstein explain that general economic conditions and the availability of housing and jobs, as well as the characteristics of the refugees themselves—their ability to speak English, education, time in the U.S., and dependence on health and social services—are also factors in determining impact.

According to ORR spokesman David Haines, "the policy implications of the study are broad, not direct," but will be reviewed along with other comments as ORR weighs implementing proposed placement rules. (See Refugee Reports, Vol. IV, No. 25.)

Copies of the study of the ethnic community role may be requested free from ORR Room 1332 Switzer Bldg., 330 C St., SW, Washington, DC 20201.
REAGAN ADMINISTRATION ISSUES REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES

The following excerpts are taken from the State Department's "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1983," a document that the Reagan administration presented to Congress in February. Human rights organizations have criticized the document, saying that it reflects a deliberate understatement and distortion of conditions in countries such as El Salvador and Guatemala (see Resources).

Afghanistan

"...large numbers of Afghans continue to leave the country clandestinely to seek refuge abroad....Most estimates place the number...at over three million...."

Austria

"Austria serves as a country of first asylum for refugees from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The government of Austria imposed recently visa requirements for most countries of Eastern Europe, making it somewhat more difficult for an intending refugee to obtain admission to the country."

El Salvador

"The continuing civil strife displaced an estimated 456,000 persons within El Salvador, primarily in the northern and eastern departments. Another 58,000 to 67,000 displaced Salvadorans lived in camps outside El Salvador, primarily in Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Mexico. Claims have been made repeatedly that Salvadorans returned from the U.S. were being singled out for persecution, primarily because they had been in the U.S. All efforts to find evidence to support these claims have been unsuccessful."

Ethiopia

"In September 1983, several hundred Ethiopians who had fled to Djibouti returned to resettlement areas in Ethiopia under a joint program of the UNHCR and the government....If successful, the program...could encompass tens of thousands of persons...No incidents of forcible repatriation of Ethiopian refugees were reported in 1983."

Federal Republic of Germany

"In recent years, the Federal Republic has become an increasingly favorite destination for both political refugees and other immigrants claiming refugee status. Under complex procedures, only about 10 percent of asylum seekers are recognized as true political refugees. The number of asylum seekers dropped [from 107,000 in 1980]...to an estimated 20,000 in 1983. Efforts to reduce nonpolitical incentives to persons claiming political refugee status have on occasion adversely affected the material well-being of true refugees."

Guatemala

"Guatemalan Indians from areas of conflict continued to move back and forth across the Mexican border. The UNHCR has estimated that there are approximately 35,000 displaced persons in Mexican camps....A much smaller number of displaced persons was in Honduras...In May, a relief organization associated with the Catholic Church estimated that there were 300,000 displaced persons within Guatemala."

Haiti

"The number of Haitians leaving by boat increased in 1983, as compared to 1982, probably because of worsening economic conditions, hunger, and drought in rural areas....All Haitians interdicted at sea by the U.S. Coast Guard were returned to Haiti after individual screenings by U.S. immigration officials determined that none had a claim to refugee status. None of those interviewed after their return have reported mistreatment...."

Kampuchea

"...some refugees who return from the Thai border are forced by the authorities to resettle in new areas on government-prepared land. These people are not heard from again by family, friends, or neighbors....The Heng Samrin regime has agreed in principle to accept refugees back from camps in Thailand but has not taken any so far....Thousands of Khmer have returned informally to Kampuchea from the Thai border."
Laos

"Although the Lao Government has said that those wishing to emigrate will be allowed to do so, as a practical matter legal emigration is rarely authorized for ethnic Lao....From May 1980...to May 1983, 2,263 Lao refugees voluntarily returned to Laos under the auspices of the UNHCR. The Lao Government suspended the program after May 1983, citing logistical problems, but repatriation resumed in November 1983."

Uganda

"In 1983 over 200,000 persons in voluntary exile remained in eastern Zaire and southern Sudan in the aftermath of the overthrow of the Amin government in 1979....[Also]...Local disturbances caused some 70,000 to flee their homes in late 1982 out of fear that their alienage would mark them for elimination and harassment by other ethnic groups. Over 35,000 went to Rwanda and others crowded into existing refugee camps in southwest Uganda....The Ugandan government...assistance has been tardy and insufficient...."

Vietnam

"During 1983, refugees continue to leave Vietnam clandestinely. However, Hanoi and provincial radio stations have broadcast reports of executions or of lengthy jail sentences for organizers of failed escape attempts, as well as punishments dealt to others [who were] implicated."


Update

* The plight of some 1600 Vietnamese refugees on the Thai/Cambodian border raised the concern of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies late last month. ACVA cabled U.S. Ambassador to Thailand John Gunther Dean saying that reports from relatives indicated that the refugees' situation was "desperate". The council suggested that the refugees' plight be resolved along the lines of what was done for an earlier group of Vietnamese who were caught once at a border point known as "NW82"; those refugees were eventually resettled in third countries. Dean cabled ACVA back, indicating that nations were awaiting a Thai response to a proposed resettlement plan. "...I am optimistic that we will be able to assist those overland Vietnamese with U.S. connections," the American ambassador said. Elsewhere on the border, a group of 254 Laotian refugees was reportedly handed over to Burmese authorities after they were pushed into Thailand from Burma. The refugees were said to have left their homeland following clashes between guerrillas and government troops. Thai officials reportedly asked Burmese officials to take the refugees back.

* In Africa, which has over 2 million refugees, drought-stricken nations are facing catastrophic economic conditions, according to UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. The secretary general gave the following statistics during a recent meeting on the crisis: over 150 million Africans are threatened by hunger and malnutrition; average per capita income is less than it was 15 years ago; only 1 in 4 Africans has access to safe drinking water; 5 million of the world's 7 million annual infant deaths occur in Africa; and about one-half of the African labor force is unemployed or underemployed.

* World Relief volunteers contributed $1.28 for every federal dollar spent on its refugee assistance caseload in 1983. That finding by the agency was released last month, along with other figures on World Relief's resettlement effort last year. According to the agency, its network resettled over 4600 refugees in 1983. Reportedly, volunteers in Chicago alone worked more than 9500 hours providing services to new arrivals. "What the [above] figures do not calculate are the many long-term sponsor/volunteer relationships that provide ongoing support and sustenance to refugees," an agency press release states.

* President Reagan awarded the Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian award, to Leo Cherne of the International
Rescue Committee on March 27. Cherne has been IRC's chairman for the past 30 years.

The Khmer American Health newsletter is available at a yearly subscription rate of $10. Vol. V, No. 2 reported it as being free.

Also, the price of Migration Today's recent issue on Cuba is a double-issue rate of $9.50 (plus $1.75 postage), not $5.75 as reported in Vol. V, No. 3.

Lastly, the refugee population for Indonesia that is listed on p. 8 of Vol. V, No. 1 should read 8,238.

Reader Exchange

TECHNICAL EXPERTS SOUGHT FOR HIGHLAND LAO PROJECTS

The Indochinese Resource Action Center (IRAC) is looking for technical consultants and trainers with cross-cultural skills to assist in Highland Lao economic development projects over the next year.

IRAC wants individuals with expertise in cottage industry, small farm and business management, and organizational management and leadership training for 48 project sites across the U.S.

Funding for the consultants and trainers has become available through a grant from the Office of Refugee Resettlement. For further information, contact the Highland Lao Resource Bank, c/o IRAC, 1424 16th St., NW, Suite 404, Washington, DC 20036.

Resources

REAGAN ADMINISTRATION HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY TERMED A FAILURE


The report also treats critically the U.S. refugee program. It indicates that the American policy was biased toward persons from communist regimes, despite the Refugee Act of 1980 which "adopted an ideologically-neutral definition of 'refugee'."

Copies of the report are available for $6/each from the Watch Committees, 46 W. 44th St., New York, NY 10036.

ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE FOR SPANISH SPEAKERS BY PHONE

Assistance is available for Spanish speakers who may need to use the phone during emergencies.

"Tele-guia" (telephone guide) is an 11 x 17 poster that gives instructions in Spanish for calling the police, an ambulance, and the fire department. The poster lists the most needed phrases in Spanish and phonetic English.

Other helpful items on the front and flip side of the poster include how to give names and addresses, useful words, phrases, and numbers for describing emergency situations.

The poster is sold singly or in bulk by V&A Communications, Inc., 7011 Polk St., Guttenberg, NJ 07093. (201) 868-3643.

"ASK IMMIGRATION" TAPE SERIES AVAILABLE

"Ask Immigration," a collection of 47 tape-recorded phone messages on immigration and citizenship questions, is a new service that is available at 13 Immigration and Naturalization Service locations nationwide.

The tapes are in English, Spanish, and Polish, and give general information about INS, alien registration cards, student and visitor status, permanent residence, filling a visa petition for a relative, travel outside the U.S., employment, and the status of undocumented aliens. Information about student status and bringing relatives to the U.S. is in Vietnamese and Creole, too.

Check with your local INS office to see if the service is available in your area.
## Statistics

### INDOCHINESE REFUGEE PROGRAM

**PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 1984**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Boat</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>7,266</td>
<td>10,376</td>
<td>581,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>536,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct (ODP)</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>8,008</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>434,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrivals</td>
<td>4,464</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td>14,942</td>
<td>1,552,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESETTLEMENT TO THE UNITED STATES

- **Vietnamese:** Boat and Land
  - Direct to U.S. 1975: 642
  - Direct (ODP): 612
  - TOTAL: 2,014

- **Khmer:** 1,200
- **Lao:** 356
- **Highlanders:** 166

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>14,562*</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>678,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESETTLEMENT TO THIRD COUNTRIES

- **Direct to PRC 1977-1979:** 126
- **Direct (ODP):** 4,640
- **From First Asylum and RPCs:** 2,818

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Departures to Other Countries</th>
<th>Jan., 1984</th>
<th>Jan., 1983</th>
<th>FY 1984 (Cumulative)</th>
<th>FY 1983 (Cumulative thru Jan)</th>
<th>Cumulative Since Apr., 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>12,056</td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>661,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL RESETTLEMENT TO THE U.S. AND THIRD COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,440</td>
<td>5,662</td>
<td>26,618</td>
<td>20,071</td>
<td>1,339,472</td>
<td>678,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL DEPARTURES

- **Voluntary Repatriation:** 0
- **Voluntary Relocation/Other:** 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>43,219</td>
<td>40,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT CAMP POPULATION

- **Indochinese Refugees in First Asylum:** 163,313
- **Indochinese Refugees/Dependants in ESL/CO training:** 22,098
- **ODP Refugees in Transit in Bangkok:** 297

|------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|

Source: Department of State, Bureau for Refugee Programs--Primary Source of Statistics: UNHCR

*Total number of persons admitted to the U.S. in immigrant status or as American citizens to date is: 1,175.*
U.S. INTERESTED IN SOME REEDUCATION PRISONERS, HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE TOLD

Freedom may have come a step closer for thousands of Vietnamese who have been held in "reeducation camps" in Vietnam for the last nine years.

That is one assessment observers have made following a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs on April 5.

At the hearing, Reagan administration witnesses indicated their willingness to accept Vietnamese in reeducation camps who have American ties.

"...the U.S. will resettle those persons in reeducation and their close relatives who qualify under our admissions program," James Purcell, director of the State Department's Bureau for Refugee Programs, told the House panel.

Observers note that the indication was the most forthright one made yet by American officials in the matter.

Reeducation, a term that refers to reforming detained political opponents through systematic indoctrination and hard labor, has been the fate of tens of thousands of Vietnamese since the fall of Saigon. Although not all are described as having suffered equally, beatings and shortages of food and medical care are said to be commonplace for the incarcerated.

State Department sources say that it is difficult to know the total number of persons who are currently in reeducation, but some 8,000 are estimated to have U.S. connections.

Issue Said to Lack Emphasis Little has transpired to date between the U.S. and Vietnam to get anyone freed, however.

Two years ago, Vietnamese Foreign Minister Thach told an interviewer that his country was interested in releasing all reeducation prisoners to the U.S.

According to sources, that statement drew hardly any public response from American officials until the House hearing, largely because the U.S. says that it wants an opportunity to screen inmates first.

Yet, other hearing witnesses suggested that lack of action on the issue can be blamed on Washington as well as Hanoi.
Recently, the Thai embassy contacted Refugee Reports asking it to publish the Thai version of the reported January "push-offs" of Vietnamese boat people from southern Thailand. That initial contact led to the Thai granting Refugee Reports permission to interview Director General for International Organizations, Nitya Phulsonggram, who serves ex officio on Thailand's anti-piracy committee. Nitya accompanied Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanonda during Prem's mid-April visit to Washington.

Paying rewards to Thai fishermen who aid boat people is "approaching piracy from the wrong angle," Nitya Phulsonggram said.

The Thai official suggested that pursuing a reward system, an approach favored by some members of Congress, would amount to treating a symptom of a problem rather than the problem itself.

"Piracy is a by-product" of a condition that stems from the policies of Hanoi, Nitya asserted.

"(Hanoi) seems to have appointed Thailand as the beacon of moral responsibility (in piracy matters). But the ultimate question of the boat people has to be resolved...."

In the course of his being interviewed, Nitya noted that although piracy would never be eradicated, it has abated recently. Despite that improvement, however, a number of misconceptions persist according to him.

In the foreign ministry official's estimation, a major misconception has to with the internationally funded, Thai-administered anti-piracy program.

Nitya indicated that the program supplements Thai efforts that normally go toward fighting piracy, and is not an initiative that has drawn Thailand into the battle against pirates only recently.

"Nobody has to tell us how to fight crime," he said. "Who sets the standard? I would like to suggest that we do." He added that Thailand would patrol for pirates regardless of international concern over the issue.

Because piracy has persisted, questions have been raised about whether Thailand is serious about combating the problem.

Nitya contended that his country is indeed serious, as evidenced by the involvement in the issue of several Thai agencies and of Thai national security chief Prasong. Additionally, Nitya pointed out that Prem had prepared for his trip abroad by reading himself "to explain the issue".

Part of the seriousness that Nitya described may stem from Thailand's concern about its image. Nitya acknowledged that his country is concerned about how the piracy issue is affecting its reputation, and he charged that press reports indicating that the pirates are Thai "are inflammatory and not helpful."

"Because piracy occurs near Thailand (does not mean the pirates are Thai)," Nitya maintained, as he referred to piracy as a regional crime that has involved Vietnamese attacks against Thai in the past.

Yet, despite the image problem, Nitya added that he didn't expect the piracy issue to affect Thailand's relations with the U.S., especially in the area of foreign aid.

Nitya called for relieving the plight of the boat people through a vehicle such as the Orderly Departure Program--"We don't want people risking their lives on the high seas"--but he also hinted that safer waters for boat people could lead to greater flows.

"If Vietnam knows that people are outside, on the water (ready to assist refugees) he suggested, "all they have to do is send more people."

On another matter, the director general confirmed that Thailand plans to send refugees to the Thai/Cambodian border who have been rejected for resettlement.

"The refugees are currently in a processing center," Nitya said, referring to the Panat Nikhom camp inside Thailand.

"If they are not being processed, why keep them there?"
For example, Roger Winter, director of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, testified that the U.S. has not vigorously pursued overtures such as Thach's.

"(Freeing reeducation camp prisoners) needs to be given the highest priority" within the administration, Winter suggested to subcommittee Chairman Stephen Solarz (D-NY).

Others agreed. In an interview after the hearing, one administration source stated, "the fact is that the U.S. has been reluctant" to take the inmates because it fears initiating an "open-ended" admissions program for prisoners. However, the source maintained that Vietnam's insistence that the U.S. take "all or none" is not as insurmountable as the Reagan administration asserts. "You can agree in principle to do that," the source said, to get negotiations started, "and work out details from there."

Piracy, ODP and Khmer Also Discussed  If reeducation prisoners emerged as a relatively new refugee concern, other issues such as piracy, the Orderly Departure Program, and the conditions of Khmer refugees reemerged before the subcommittee as it considered the overall question of refugees in Asia.

On the piracy forefront, Purcell indicated that State was ready to pursue an approach that is favored by Solarz--rewarding Thai fishermen who report the whereabouts of boat people on the high seas or who inform on suspected pirates.

Such a reward system is reported to be working in Malaysia and, in Solarz's opinion, is a necessary tonic for the two-year-old, internationally funded anti-piracy program, which has produced few arrests (see opposite page).

In late March, it was reported that a Thai fishing boat captain and three crew members were apprehended on charges of raping and robbing boat people. The arrests are said to be the first of their kind in over two years.

"The notion that two spotter planes and a decoy boat (are going to be effective in fighting piracy) is ludicrous," Solarz said of the current program.

The subcommittee chairman also complained that State chose to set aside most of the $5 million Congress voted to spend on anti-piracy measures in FY 84 on previously tried approaches rather than new and additional ones.

Nonetheless, the toughest questioning on piracy came from Benjamin Gilman (R-N.Y.).

Gilman fired several questions to State Department witnesses about the poor conviction rate, the lack of a tracing system for abductees, and other inadequacies that have slowed the fight against piracy. Purcell responded by recounting steps that State has taken to improve the international anti-piracy program, and noted initiatives that will be taken in the future. According to the bureau director, the initiatives will include strengthened enforcement on land, additional staff for monitoring anti-piracy efforts, and redoubling rescue at sea programs.

[State Department officials also assured congressmen that the piracy would be raised in meetings with Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanonda, who was scheduled to meet with President Reagan in Washington on April 13. Apparently, the issue surfaced as promised. The Washington Post reported on April 14 that "the continuing flow of refugees from Vietnam, including the problem of piracy in the Gulf of Thailand..." was among the topics discussed by the two leaders.]

ODP to be Recast Slightly  As for the Orderly Departure Program, it continued to be favored by the administration as the only reasonable alternative to illegal boat escapes.

Purcell indicated, however, that ODP may be given a slightly different cast.

Currently, all ODP numbers are counted against the ceiling that is annually established for refugees in first asylum in Southeast Asia. So far, the numbers have been relatively unsubstantial--12,000 persons left Vietnam via ODP for the U.S. in FY 83--but observers have maintained that counting ODP participants as refugees could be a source of unease in Thailand, a first asylum nation that is constantly concerned about the "offtake" of its refugees by resettlement countries.

According to Purcell, State plans to propose for next fiscal year that ODP numbers be subtracted from the overall refugee ceiling, rather than the Southeast Asian
limit alone.

Though such a switch would be considered an improvement, it would still be "robbing Peter to pay Paul" according to the administration source cited earlier, who suggested that ODP numbers and refugee numbers should not be lumped together at all.

Still, concerns with ODP did not end on the note of numbers allocations. For example, Leo Dorsey, former executive director of the International Institute of Boston, testified that ODP has largely reflected the wishes of Vietnam alone. "In fact the Vietnamese government has historically ignored the lists of priority cases submitted by the U.S. government and today, only five percent of ODP cases match names...about whom the U.S. states a concern," he said.

Dorsey, who worked temporarily in the ODP program in Vietnam in recent months, suggested that the U.S. should prod Vietnam to broaden the categories of persons it is allowing to leave. To do otherwise, he said, would be tantamount to underestimating "the importance of ODP to the Vietnamese government regarding its desired communications with the U.S." and the rest of the world.

Food Shortage Said to be Facing Some Khmer

Numbers of another kind were also brought to the attention of lawmakers. Appearing on behalf of the Cambodia Crisis Committee, Peter Pond testified that some 15,000 undocumented Khmer in Kao-I-Dang, a refugee camp near the Thai/Cambodian border, are suffering from a food shortage. Pond added that 50,000 Khmer currently in the border area have family members in the U.S. with whom they "wait to be reunited."

As Pond and USCR Director Winter called for greater leadership and compassion on the part of the U.S. in its approach to refugee questions, they had one formidable ally—Mark O. Hatfield, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Appearing as a witness, the Oregon Republican declared that "America will cease to exist" if it resorts to reasons such as "compassion fatigue" as a justification for "turning its backs on refugees."

"We must continue to provide hope," Hatfield said of the U.S. role. "We must provide hope to those who have no voice."

Recent Developments

UNFAIR NEGATIVE IMAGE HINDERS HAITIANS, STUDY SAYS

Haitians in southern Florida have suffered from a number of difficulties since their recent arrival in the U.S., not the least of which is a negative image of them as poor, black, uneducated persons who live on welfare.

Yet, according to a study released in March by Dr. Alex Stepick of the Florida International University in Miami, "neither the Krome Haitians (those released from detention by a 1982 court order) nor the earlier arriving Haitian entrants conforms to the common negative stereotype."

Stepick's study, "Haitians Released from Krome: Their Prospects for Adaptation and Integration in South Florida," is based on a recent survey of 150 former detainees. The study compares these newest Haitian arrivals with a survey of pre-1982 Haitian entrants.

While the research shows Krome Haitians to be somewhat less educated and professionally qualified than earlier arrivals, both groups are said to have "education and motivation levels that far exceed what is commonly believed."

For the most part, Stepick found neither group of Haitians on public assistance. "They rely upon neither the government nor private agencies for anything they can do themselves," the study says.
Comparing the Haitians with others in high unemployment situations such as American black teenagers, Yves Savain, the former director of the Haitian Task Force in Miami, commented, "the Haitians tend more frequently to look for work....They're not resolved to remain unemployed."

Nonetheless, their chances for employment in the U.S. appear to be slim—67 percent of the Krome Haitians and 60 percent of Haitian entrants were unemployed. On closer examination, however, Stepick found that it is "more accurate to describe the Haitians as primarily underemployed, supporting themselves mainly by part-time, temporary work."

Many in the Haitian community of 25,000 in southern Florida are working in what is called the "informal economy," according to Stepick. They are described as opening home restaurants, working as carpenters, doing piece work, repairing cars on front lawns, laying bricks, and vending wares on the street.

Krome Haitians Have Had More Difficulty However, the study indicates that Krome Haitians have had more difficulty finding employment than their earlier counterparts. Overwhelmingly, they cited detention as their greatest difficulty since coming to the U.S., and a significant proportion sensed that black as well as white Americans are prejudiced against them.

With few employment options, over 67 percent of the former detainees reported having worked at some point in Florida agriculture, compared to 23 percent of other Haitian entrants. Still, the Krome Haitians do not appear to be becoming part of the migrant labor force that travels the East Coast in search of work, as they have chosen to remain in Florida, according to the study.

Savain called this group, the "commuters". After working for some weeks or months at one of the farm areas 40-60 miles from Miami, they go back to the city to try to find other work, hoping that economic conditions have changed and luck will be on their side. When it isn't, the so-called commuters go back to farm work.

Although farming provides jobs, the study finds that it also fosters isolation of the Haitians from Americans. The remoteness is said to hinder their learning English, as well as American culture. Nonetheless, Stepick contends that "while it is not the best road to adaptation and integration, agricultural labor is better than no job at all."

Thus, the study's author recommends against expanding the H-2 temporary foreign worker program that he says will not only hurt Haitians already in the U.S., but black Americans, too.

Stepick also calls for adjustment of the Haitians' status to that of permanent residents, expansion of federal assistance for language and job training, and technical and financial assistance to the small Haitian business community.

According to Savain, that business community consists of about 100 legal enterprises and perhaps an equal number of illegal ones in southern Florida. Though it is not easily penetrated and "fairly marginal" in terms of providing jobs for Haitians, researchers like Stepick in conjunction with the Haitian Task Force are now studying ways that the Haitian enclave might be developed.

"There is potential here," Savain explained. "How many people they employ is not as important as what they project [about Haitians] to the community-at-large. (It's important that) Haitians are seen as self-sufficient, as entrepreneurs. Ultimately, this is what people in this country respect," he said.

Copies of the 41-page study can be purchased for $4 each from the Latin American and Caribbean Center, Florida International University, TM 225, Miami, FL 33199.

**Update**

Twenty-eight California democratic congressmen have written President Reagan charging that proposed funding cut-backs in the nation's refugee program are "an affront to the Congress..." The lawmakers, who held a news conference in Washington earlier this month to bring attention to their position, are specifically upset over administration plans to cut social services funds and to shift federal money for targeted assistance programs to those for social services. A main point of contention for the legislators is the Office of...
Refugee Resettlement's approach of basing budget plans on the flow of new arrivals rather than the number of refugees who may need services, regardless of their date of entry. Citing legislative precedent, the Democrats said that approach "is a blatant contravention of congressional intent." ORR spokesman Deborah Pontiso declined to comment on the matter, deferring questions to the White House, whose spokesman, Paul Simmons, could not be reached by press time.

Extended voluntary departure status for some 2,000 Ugandans in the U.S. is due to expire on April 30. At press time, Immigration and Naturalization Service spokesman Janet Graham said she had "no idea" whether the status would be granted again. EVD was first made available to Ugandans in June 1978 and has been re-extended in six-month increments numerous times since then. Unofficially, however, it has been reported that INS will not renew EVD for Ugandans because doing so would be politically embarrassing since the status is being denied to other groups such as Salvadorans.

Projects and Programs

CENSUS DEVELOPING REFUGEE DATA BASE

A new data base at the U.S. Census Bureau may aid researchers who are interested in world-wide refugee statistics. Stored at the Bureau's International Research Center, the data base contains statistics on refugee movements that are part of demographic and socio-economic information used to derive the population estimates of foreign countries.

Currently, the only data about refugees relate to Central America. They are comprised mostly of UNHCR figures, but also include statistics from other federal agencies, foreign governments, academic journals, and newspapers. Statistical tables are arranged by country of origin; for example, researchers can find the number and location of Salvadoran refugees throughout Central America and Mexico for each of the last five years.

The center published these tables in a January special report, "Central American Refugee Flows: 1978-1983." The publication shows refugee conditions at six-month intervals, and includes a 15-page narrative on the problems of data collection in Central America, as well as an explanation of the refugee movements there.

In referring to their refugee data, center officials warn that Census does not use its own criteria or any single criterion for defining a "refugee."

Rather, "the term 'refugee'...simply refers to persons who are reported as such by international organizations," author Linda Peterson wrote in Census' report on Central America.

By summer, officials hope that recent refugee information on all Third World countries will be part of the data base. At a later date, Third World and European refugee data from 1950 through the present are expected to be available.

According to research director Silvia Quick, details about the refugees' age, sex, ethnic group, and occupation may be included eventually, too, if more money becomes available for developing Census' refugee data. Currently, the development is being financed with $600,000 from Congress and funds that have been raised through projects done with other federal agencies. The FY85 budget request for the data base is $1.2 million.

Count of Illegals Expected Despite its international research, the main function of Census remains tracking the total number of U.S. residents.

Refugees, however, are not counted by the agency. For example, Census' decennial population count indicates "foreign-born" persons in the U.S. without noting their status or manner of entry. Also, according to Census demographers, monthly surveys that are conducted to update records and provide labor statistics use population samples too small to count refugees adequately.

However, the bureau's Population Division is working to estimate the number of illegals in the U.S. Demographer Jeffrey Passel said that Census expects to have such an estimate by fall that will be based on a random survey of 60,000 households.

Passel noted that the survey's informa-
tion will be confidential. "We would never do anything like conduct a survey on the number of illegal aliens and then turn it over [to authorities]," he said.

An empirical study conducted by the division last year found that between 2 and 4 million illegal aliens were living in the U.S. in 1980. That study compared 1980 census data on the foreign-born with Immigration and Naturalization Service statistics on legal immigration to the U.S. in order to derive an estimate.

*
*
*
*
*

Researchers can request the free Central American refugee study by contacting the Center for International Research, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233, (202) 763-4086. Information in the data base is offered to other government agencies and to the public through the sale of tapes and print-outs.

Due to an error in our computerized mailing list, a number of readers missed issues of Refugee Reports in February and March. Copies are being sent now and should be received shortly. If you are still missing issues after May 1, please let us know.

Also, because of the installation of new word processing equipment and training of new staff, issue Nos. 7 and 8 and 9 and 10 will be combined. The first double issue will be published on May 18, the second on June 15.

Resources

BOOKLET ON KHMER AVAILABLE

"Acculturation Difficulties of the Khmer in New York City," a booklet by Ellen Bruno, explains the recent history, culture, and religious traditions of Khmer refugees. Prepared for American service providers and volunteers, the booklet also provides information about the family, housing, employment, and medical and mental health problems encountered by Khmer.

To request a copy, send $2.00 to: Cambodian Women's Program, American Friends Service Committee, 15 Rutherford Pl, New York, NY 10003.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR INDOCHINESE AVAILABLE ON VIDEOTAPE

The Center for Indochinese Health Education at the University of California, San Diego, has developed a 1/2 VHS videotape that contains 10 separate health educational programs produced by the center.

The program includes the following topics: Intestinal Parasites, Childhood Immunizations, TB Skin Test, TB and Your Hospital Stay, Prenatal Care, Cesarian Birth, Post-Partum Care, Formula Feeding, Colposcopy, and Prescription Drugs.

The videotape is available in five languages—English, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Lao and Hmong—is 90 minutes long, and costs $75 per copy. Printed English scripts are available. The same 10 programs are also available individually in a slide-tape format. The price per program varies, but averages $75 plus $5 per language audio-tape.

Contact: Robert J. Moser, Ph.D., Center for Indochinese Health Education, USCD Medical Center, 225 Dickinson Street, San Diego, Calif. 92103. (619) 294-3724.

VIDEOCASSETTE ON HMONG AVAILABLE

"Children of Change," a 26-minute videocassette on the Hmong way of life in the U.S., has just been made available by the University of Washington, Seattle. According to its producers, "Children of Change" has a two-fold purpose—to introduce the Hmong and the difficulties they are having in the U.S. to educators, students, and communities; and, to point out "how we all discriminate against those who are different."

The videocassette, which is in color and was produced in 1983, also comes accompanied by a taped panel discussion. To rent these materials contact: Instructional Media Services, Material Scheduling Office (DG-10), 35D Kane Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195 (206) 543-9901; to purchase, contact: Instructional Media Services, Preview and Acquisitions (DG-10), 23A Kane Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195 (206) 543-9906.
## FY 84 Refugees Arrivals as of February 29, 1984 (All Nationalities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YTD FY 84</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YTD FY 84</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>CIT.*</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>CIT.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>BORN ON SEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>ANGOLA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>PANAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PARAGUAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>7780</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>1407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SOMALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMAI</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SUDAN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>GERMANY (Fed.Rep.)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U.S.R.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>VIETNAM</td>
<td>9247</td>
<td>9333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>SW AFRICA/NAIM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YUGOSLAVIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>ZAIRE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>AMERICAN SAMOA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ZAMBIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>GUAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>JOHNSON ATOLL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>NC. PANAMA ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KAMPUCHEA</td>
<td>5172</td>
<td>5804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>MIDWAY ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LAOS</td>
<td>2658</td>
<td>2871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>TRUST TERRITORIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LIBYA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>VIRGIN ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LIBERTO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>WAKE ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MALAWI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOZAMBIQUE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOR YTD FY84</td>
<td>24738</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24738</td>
<td></td>
<td>24738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information in this report is based on documents from ACVA, IOM and other federal agencies available on the date of this report and may not include information on all refugees in the categories reported.

**Note:** Children born in refugee camps are assigned citizenship of parents. Citizenship information is often lacking, especially for non-Southeast Asians.

**Source:** Office of Refugee Resettlement.

---
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GROWTH IN ORDERLY DEPARTURE PROGRAM BRINGS POTENTIAL AND PROBLEMS

Recently, the U.S. Department of State asked Leo Dorsey to assist the Orderly Departure Program for a four-month period, both in Thailand and Vietnam. Dorsey, a voluntary agency director in Vietnam during the war and more recently administrator of a refugee resettlement agency in Boston, returned impressed with most of what he had witnessed and with high praise for the staff, but also suggesting that certain aspects of the program be reviewed. In this article, Dorsey sets forth his views on the program as it operates today and discusses some of the problems he identified in the course of his stay.

Established in 1979 as a legal alternative to the massive refugee exodus from Vietnam, the Orderly Departure Program now accounts for more departures from that country than arrivals of boat people in asylum countries. In calendar years 1980-83, almost 40,000 individuals were resettled under the program, about 40 percent of them in the U.S. and the remainder in other third countries. A backlog of applications representing almost half a million individuals suggests the high level of interest in the program.

Based on sheer numbers, then, ODP has been a success, although boat flows do continue and ODP cannot be credited exclusively with their somewhat diminished levels. But other factors need to be considered in assessing the merits of the program and the degree to which it has dealt with the problems it was established to correct.

One critical issue involves the extent to which U.S. priority interests are represented. The initial involvement of the U.S. in ODP was based upon a desire to provide a legal means for certain categories of Vietnamese—those with immediate family relatives in the U.S., former U.S. government employees, and persons with close ties to the U.S.—to leave Vietnam for resettlement in this country. In participating in the program, the hope was that it would reduce the flow of boat refugees to other countries in East Asia.
Direct Departures of Vietnamese From Vietnam to the U.S. and Other Resettlement Countries by Calender Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>to U.S.</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>to other</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Total O.D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,284</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>8,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10,746</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>14,976</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23,820</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau for Refugee Programs

According to procedures established in 1980, the U.S. was to present a list of those who qualified for the program to the Vietnamese government through UNHCR. The Vietnamese government, in turn, was to present a list of Vietnamese approved to leave that country, through UNHCR, to the U.S. government. Persons appearing on both lists were to be placed on a joint list and would be eligible for departure to the U.S. after final interviews and processing by American UNHCR staff in Vietnam. Such a formula, it was believed, would allow for both the U.S. and Vietnam to achieve their goals under the program.

U.S. Lists Ignored Since the beginning of the program, however, lists of persons submitted by the U.S. have been virtually ignored by the Vietnamese government. Accurate statistics are not available from the Department of State regarding the number of ODP departures appearing on U.S. lists, but ODP staff in Bangkok report that the number could be less than 10 percent.

That Vietnam has identified particular unwanted groups (largely the ethnic Chinese and Amerasian children) as the vast percentage of its priority list is not the issue. It makes sense that a sizable percentage of the ODP population be those recommended by the Vietnamese government, and all such departures have conformed to the eligibility standards of the U.S. government.

The concern should be that, because U.S. lists have been ignored, persons of special interest to this country (i.e., persons who worked for the U.S. government during the war and persons who have served in re-education camps) have essentially been denied access to the program. As a result, thousands of Vietnamese in specific categories which meet U.S. priorities continue to be forced to view illegal flight by boat as the only realistic method of leaving the country.

Program Should Provide a Hope There has been a decline recently in boat departures from Vietnam. But I am convinced from my experiences in Vietnam and from extensive interviews with boat refugees in Thailand that the decline has been influenced by improved effectiveness of the security system in Vietnam, rumors about the increased brutality of pirates in the South China Sea, and knowledge that first asylum countries are less hospitable, rather than by an increase in the credibility of ODP among the most desperate Vietnamese populations.

The underlying principle in the establishment of ODP as an effective means of reducing the boat refugee exodus was not that it could provide an opportunity for everyone who wished to leave Vietnam. Rather, the primary principle was that all populations who were eligible for the program would have an opportunity to apply, and the program thereby would extend a reasonable hope that they could be selected, thus reducing the motivation to risk the perilous flight by sea. That principle has been undermined by the current selection process.

In order that U.S. priority interests be served by the program, and for ODP to be established as an effective deterrent to the boat exodus, a significantly larger number of those departing under ODP should
be persons who have been included on U.S. lists to the Vietnamese government. Fears that the program might be eliminated were the U.S. to insist on such a formula are most certainly baseless, particularly in light of recent statements by the Vietnamese government encouraging an increase in the size of the program, their desire to significantly reduce unwanted populations, and the importance Vietnam places on a dialogue with the U.S. Failure to adopt such a policy, on the other hand, will ensure that the continuing flow of boat refugees will include those about whom the U.S. has expressed its special concern.

ODP and U.S. Commitments to East Asian Countries Governments in East Asia, and particularly Thailand, have repeatedly urged that a serious commitment be made by other countries to reduce the heavy domestic political pressure presented by large numbers of refugees on their soil. As of March, Thailand alone had almost 130,000 Indochinese refugees within its borders (and thousands more at its borders), and any serious prospect that it might be left alone with the responsibility of harboring this population might well lead Thailand once again to force Indochinese refugees out of this asylum country.

Because currently the majority of ODP cases are applied to the ceiling set by the U.S. for refugees from East Asia, there is a real possibility that significant growth in the ODP program could be perceived as a threat to our commitments to allies who are first asylum counties for non-ODP cases in this region.

During FY 84, only 6,600 ODP cases will be applied to the East Asia ceiling, or 13 percent of the 50,000 allowable admissions. The number, however, would have been closer to 20 percent had not 2,400 ODP cases been assigned to cultural orientation programs in the Philippines during this fiscal year. Incorporating this population and the projected estimates of 9,000 new ODP cases, the total to be charged against the East Asia ceiling in FY 85 could approximate 30 percent. Such a development would indeed pose a serious threat to our commitments to Thailand and other asylum countries.

Cutting Back ODP Not the Answer One answer to the problem would be to maintain the present size of ODP or, as some have suggested, to reduce its scope. But removing opportunities for family reunification and squelching the hopes of many who have suffered greatly under the present regime in Vietnam is hardly a humanitarian or rational solution. Just as important a reason to reject a reduction in ODP is that it still has the potential to be the most effective deterrent to an uncontrolled tide of boat refugees or to rescue others of interest for whom boat escape is not a viable option, assuming that a broader section of the population be allowed to apply.

To ensure that the U.S. meets its commitment, adjustments could be made in the ceiling for refugees arriving in the U.S. from the East Asia region. The East Asia ceiling might be established on the basis of the projected ODP population in a particular year, or ODP cases could be assigned to unfilled refugee numbers from other regions of the world (e.g., Soviet Union). Alternatively, a separate ceiling might be established for ODP groups of special concern to the U.S., including Amerasian children and their families and persons having spent considerable time in re-education camps in Vietnam.

This latter group of perhaps some 9,000 individuals requires particular attention by the U.S. Since 1982, Vietnam has repeatedly offered to permit the departure, presumably by ODP, of re-education camp inmates. Most recently, the offer was stated in an interview with Prime Minister Pham Van Dong in the May 14 Newsweek magazine. The U.S., too, has publicly expressed its interest in this group, but to date has done nothing to use ODP or other mechanisms to put in place a release program.

Administrative and Technical Resources With the significant growth of ODP over a short period of time, the managerial resources and skills required for program administration have also grown.

There are approximately 70 staff assigned to processing and managing current records associated with over 120,000 family petitions. It is their task to answer inquiries from concerned relatives in the U.S.; respond to congressional inquiries; arrange for the travel of ODP cases to Bangkok; coordinate medical clearances and
flight arrangements of ODP cases to the U.S.; and relate biographical data about all departures to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies in New York. It is a complicated and difficult assignment, made Herculean by the absence of computer capabilities. Indeed, the very numbers of cases being processed manually makes the monitoring function virtually impossible, and oftentimes results in the loss of essential documents.

Computer capabilities would allow for considerable personnel cost savings, while helping the program to communicate quickly about the status of applications and to provide U.S. refugee resettlement agencies with comprehensive biographical data about cases assigned to them.

No less important is the need to provide ODP with the skills and manpower to deal with complex personnel and program functions. Currently there are only three staff positions allocated for overall managerial responsibilities, resulting in a superficial management operation.

There is an immediate need for additional staff to develop programs in employee orientation, staff development, program evaluation, and staff supervision. Not to mention the effect these resources would lend to ODP in terms of increased operational efficiency, such improvements would greatly assist those staff members working in Vietnam, virtually cut off from their counterparts in Bangkok and heavily dependent on a well-informed and competent staff at the headquarters office in Thailand.

Cooperative Arrangement Could Help Management A significant element related to the backlog of ODP cases, and a critical factor in the ability of ODP to increase departures from Vietnam, is the limited number of U.S. consular officers made available to the program. Only four consular officers are associated with ODP, and they are responsible for a final review of all ODP petitions, developing U.S. lists for submission to the Vietnamese government, and traveling to Vietnam each week to interview each case before their flight to Bangkok. The program would not be able to handle a larger caseload without additional consular officers.

Finally, ODP performs functions somewhat different from those carried out by the State Department Refugee Program in Thailand and, because of its unique relationship with UNHCR, operates under a different mandate. Nevertheless, there are many areas in which the agencies perform similar functions, since both are engaged in processing refugees for resettlement in the U.S.

In light of the substantial increase in resources needed by ODP, it makes sense to explore ways in which the two programs could work together more closely and share common resources such as computers, manpower, and space. A more consolidated relationship might also enhance the ability of the U.S. government to coordinate ODP with commitments to asylum countries, thus reducing potential tensions over ODP and perhaps expanding opportunities in Asia for the orientation of ODP cases.

Programs Needed to Resettle ODP Cases Unlike Indochinese boat people and land refugees entering the U.S., ODP cases have not benefited from the six months of cultural orientation and ESL training provided in Thailand and the Philippines. As long as numbers were small, refugee resettlement agencies in the U.S. were able to deal with the special needs of ODP populations. In the absence of additional resources, however, resettlement agencies are straining to incorporate the significantly larger ODP populations into their caseloads. Especially difficult has been the resettlement of Amerasian children and their families, due to the unique psychological scars incurred by this group as a result of extreme discrimination in Vietnam.

Extensive efforts have been undertaken by the U.S. State Department during the past year to expand existing cultural orientation and ESL training facilities in Asia to include ODP cases, and the first group of 2,400 will be enrolled in the Philippines program during the second half of this fiscal year. Additional efforts are needed to make training available for all ODP cases.

Pointers Related to ODP Petitions There are a number of elements important in filing a successful ODP petition. For example, all required documents related to proof of eligibility should be obtained and
sent to the ODP office in Bangkok. The loss of original documents or the existence of records solely in Vietnam does not necessarily pose an impediment to proof of eligibility, since Vietnamese authorities have been generally cooperative in making records and court documents available. Where government offices were destroyed in the war and original extracts of essential documents are unavailable, it is important and relatively easy to obtain a verification letter from the appropriate district office.

In selecting records to be submitted, priority should be given to documents issued by authorities before 1975, and in the event that primary documents (i.e. birth records, marriage certificates, etc.) are unavailable, numerous secondary records should be submitted. Meaningful secondary documents include family household registers, school and medical records, Chinese passports, military IDs, drivers licenses, etc. For those lacking pertinent records, a notarized autobiography (Ly Lich) should be submitted. Finally, many Vietnamese family members changed their names and dates of birth for a variety of reasons during the war. In such cases, a full disclosure of the facts should be clearly stated, since there are methods for incorporating corrected information within ODP procedures and since fraudulent information can be the basis for the rejection of a petition.

The ODP Program in Vietnam Since it began operation, ODP has been represented by an American UNHCR staff member in Vietnam responsible for conducting the interviews of ODP cases wishing to depart for the U.S. There are now four interviewers attached to the program. They work six days a week to keep up with the large caseload of Vietnamese who have already been issued exit permits by the Vietnamese government. Their job is challenging and difficult, because their lifestyle is very restricted and because the process of determining the eligibility of desperate groups of persons is complex.

The American staff in Vietnam have no influence in selecting who will be interviewed and cannot initiate an interview with any Vietnamese. The determination of who is to be interviewed and when is made entirely by the Vietnamese government, and all interviewees are screened for their exit permits before being allowed into the ODP office.

A U.S. Letter of Introduction on behalf of an ODP case to the Vietnamese government is no guarantee that a government exit permit will be issued by the Vietnamese authorities. Similarly, having an exit permit from the Vietnamese government does not guarantee an interview with the UNHCR representatives in Vietnam. It is estimated that 20,000 Vietnamese currently hold exit permits, a factor which in itself dictates a long wait for an interview.

Amerasians Have Good Access Among those who have experienced relatively easy access to the program have been Amerasian children and their families. Over 1,300 Amerasians and family members have already left Vietnam under ODP, and they continue to leave at an average rate of 400 per month. Vietnamese authorities have estimated that there are 15,000 Amerasian children still in Vietnam. The U.S. has verified the existence of only 8,000, and it has requested the Vietnamese to conduct a country-wide survey to obtain an accurate number.

Finally, interviews with ODP arrivals in Thailand suggest that those experiencing greatest access to the program are persons living in Ho Chi Minh City who are of ethnic Chinese origin and who have substantial amounts of money to obtain an exit permit. There are, of course, exceptions to the rule.

Conclusion ODP functions with substantial limitations. Yet, it continues to be the only vehicle for the U.S. and other countries to provide a humane option for legal exodus from Vietnam. Over 38,000 persons have gained freedom through ODP during the past four years, 15,000 of whom have been resettled in the U.S. It is in the interest of the U.S. government to continue participation in the program and to demonstrate support by providing the resources ODP needs to meet its objectives. To do less will result in less.
Recent Developments

VOLAG OFFICIAL POINTS TO HONG KONG CAMP PROBLEMS

In a recent statement presented to the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Donald Bjork, associate executive director of World Relief, expressed concern about "certain deplorable conditions" in Hong Kong camps. A working tour of Asian refugee camps and processing centers in January and February convinced him, he said, that the situation in Hong Kong needed more attention.

In 1982, Hong Kong initiated a "closed camp" policy to deter Vietnamese refugees from coming to Hong Kong, Bjork recounted. New arrivals are usually assigned to closed centers where they are strictly controlled, have little contact with the outside, and are not permitted outside work. "They're virtual prisoners," he said.

Closed Centers "Better Off" But in the closed centers he visited, with relatively large outdoor areas, fresh air and light, "refugees were almost better off than those in Jubilee Center, an open camp," Bjork said in an interview with Refugee Reports. Jubilee is a single building in an urban area. A wire fence encloses a narrow yard around the building. Originally designed to accommodate a maximum of 500 British army personnel and families, the center held 2,677 refugees when Bjork visited.

Bjork described three or four stories of damp, dingy rooms, each with two rows of bunk-like wooden cubicles rising in three tiers to the high ceiling. "The smell of urine mingled with sweat permeated the air, while barefooted, runny-nosed children tried to play on the tiny pad of wet concrete between bunks," he wrote. There were very few windows and rooms were lighted by single bare bulbs. Each of these rooms, lacking even minimal privacy, was home to as many as 30 refugees.

Outdoor cooking facilities at Jubilee Center were primitive and unhygienic, Bjork said. Refugees often cooked over small charcoal stoves in their rooms. That, coupled with the building's old wiring, creates a serious fire hazard, the volag official indicated.

Bjork was impressed with the refugees' attitudes under the conditions he observed. "They do their best. They are tough, used to hard lives. They survive, often for years, in a situation where we'd go berserk. They are not complainers." Bjork suggested that the Hong Kong authorities do little to improve conditions, in part, because they feel the refugees "are used to it, that they can take it." The concerns the refugees did express were over why they had to stay in the center and why they had to wait so long to be resettled.

Reprehensible Policy According to Bjork, voluntary agencies "have done their best to offset [Hong Kong's] blatant disregard for human dignity." They have opened a junior school, a playgroup, a health clinic, a nursery, and recreation and community centers. English language training is provided, and a refugee committee for self-government has been set up.

The problem, says Bjork, is that the building itself is so bad that any efforts at improvement can make only the smallest difference.

Bjork admitted that the refugees in Jubilee Center are almost all rural Vietnamese with little knowledge of health and hygiene standards. But he said that did not excuse the Hong Kong authorities' failure to improve hygiene conditions. In his statement to the House subcommittee, Bjork linked conditions at Jubilee Center to "an underlying government policy [that] is absolutely reprehensible."

Slow Off-take Creates Problem William Dorward, commissioner for Hong Kong commercial affairs, had not seen the Jubilee Center but said, in an interview with Refugee Reports, "The problems in Hong Kong's refugee centers are not of Hong Kong's making. They are a result of adhering absolutely fully to international agreements." Dorward, the senior Hong Kong government official in the U.S., said, "We have never turned a boat away. We continue to provide temporary asylum to all boat arrivals and now have the highest boat refugee population in the region." However, he stated that the rate of off-take to the U.S. from Hong Kong is lower than that from Thailand, Malaysia or the Phillipines.

The rate of departures since the Immi-
gration and Naturalization Service implemented new processing guidelines in August 1983 has actually fallen below earlier rates, according to Dorward. Adding to the problem was a chicken pox outbreak in January and February, resulting in a departure moratorium from all but two of Hong Kong's camps. The 50 births in Hong Kong camps in March further suggest the problems authorities face, Dorward said.

U.S. State Department statistics for the first three months of FY 84, just before the chicken pox outbreak, confirm that Hong Kong has the largest share of boat refugees in temporary asylum countries in Asia and that the rate of outflow, particularly to the U.S. and refugee processing centers, is comparatively low (see Refugee Reports, Vol. V, No. 1).

Dorward stressed that Hong Kong, by far the most crowded place in the world, has been in a period of financial stringency for the last couple of years, with limited resources for indigenous people as well as for refugees. "Camp conditions, if not ideal, are a result of financial limitations and not for lack of humanitarian concern," according to Dorward. The closed camp policy was, he added, "an unpalatable but necessary measure, in the Hong Kong government's view, to ameliorate rapidly deteriorating conditions."

British officials in Washington, noting substantial efforts by the Hong Kong government to improve conditions, indicated that the U.S. government's response to British requests for a sympathetic hearing on the Hong Kong refugee situation has not been encouraging.

U.S. Lead Important While Bjork emphasized that Hong Kong does have legitimate concerns and needs the cooperation of the U.S. and other countries, he rejected Hong Kong's difficulties as a justification for the conditions he observed. Bjork called on the U.S. to press these concerns on the Hong Kong government but also questioned the ability of the U.S. to put credible pressure on Hong Kong officials if this country admits fewer and fewer refugees.

Noting that U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs Eugene Douglas has said refugees will remain a worldwide problem at least through the year 2000, Bjork suggested that the U.S. needs a long-term commitment and plan. "It is clear that other nations follow the lead of the U.S." Bjork concluded, "The U.S. must set an example of generosity, setting its share of refugee admissions according to what is right, not what is expedient."

PIRACY ISSUE REACHES PRESIDENTIAL AGENDA

A long-awaited development occurred in the fight against piracy attacks on Vietnamese boat people --- the issue was raised during discussions last month between President Ronald Reagan and Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsoulanonda.

In those discussions, the president noted that piracy partly contributed to "making the U.S. role with respect to refugees much more difficult," according to James Purcell, director of the State Department's Bureau for Refugee Programs. Since previous funds apparently have not led to an improvement in the piracy picture, a source explained, further funding may be controversial.

Purcell cited the exchange between the two leaders in an April 15 letter to Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. Solarz and six other congressmen had urged that piracy be raised when Prem visited Washington last month (see Refugee Reports Vol. 5, No. 6), and another interested party, the U.S. Committee for Refugees, had been calling for "active participation" by the White House in solving the piracy problem since the committee's release of a report on piracy in February.

Push-Offs Not Thai Policy According to Purcell, the Thai response to Reagan consisted of noting recent convictions of four suspects, a drop-off in the rate of boats being attacked, and the problems of patrolling an area as large as the Gulf of Thailand. Additionally, though the Thai were reported to have pushed away refugee boats earlier this year, Purcell told Solarz that, in their discussions with the president, "the Thai responded flatly that push-offs of refugees are not Thai policy" and that violators of that edict "will be punished."

Although the State Department has given no indication that the discussions were substantive, observers consider the fact
that a discussion of piracy between Reagan and Prem occurred at all to be a positive development. Nonetheless, disturbing reports about attacks as well as the fate of the international anti-piracy program have arisen since the meeting.

**Severe Attacks Continue** For example, unconfirmed word reached Washington that at least one and possibly more severe attacks occurred during March and April. According to a well-informed source, 30 to 40 people may have died in a single attack that left only one survivor. The source explained that victims' hands were tied before they were tossed overboard by pirates and that children were left aboard the refugees' boat as it was rammed. The source added that another attack may have cost at least 10 and possibly as many as 20 lives, and noted that there had also been reports about recent incidents that were less severe but marked nonetheless by considerable brutality.

Official information about the attacks was unavailable from either the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Washington or the State Department.

Privately, sources speculated that the reason for the lack of information stemmed from nervousness over a meeting of prospective contributors to the international anti-piracy program that was scheduled for Geneva on May 11. The meeting had originally been scheduled for February but was postponed after the reports of push-offs of boat people from Thailand led to a souring of relations between UNHCR and Thailand. The meeting was to consider proposals to extend the program for another year.

**U.S. Dissatisfied with Efforts** Though the U.S. remains committed to the anti-piracy program, American officials are said to be nervous for a variety of reasons.

The continued attacks are one problem. As recently as six weeks ago, State Department witnesses described to Congress a decreasing piracy problem and indicated their confidence that improvements in the program would be adopted by the Thai under an extension. But unofficially, there is said to be deep dissatisfaction over the lack of results in the battle against piracy and Thai attitudes toward the program's renewal.

According to a source cited earlier, one stumbling block is a Thai request for a $2.5 million patrol craft. The Thai are said to consider the boat necessary for effective patrolling, but other observers maintain that the bid for the craft should be honored only after the Thai provide clear evidence that they are serious about ending pirate attacks.

Another factor complicating the picture is said to be the need for continued "internationalization" of the battle against piracy. State Department officials who met with congressional staffs at the end of last month were said to be concerned that the world community's interest in donating to a program is slight, while the U.S. is poised to spend millions on a continuation.

While internationalization is a concern, however, some observers have other interests. An aide to Rep. Benjamin Gilman (R-N.Y.), for example, noted that Gilman, who is a member of the House Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, wants results from the anti-piracy program. "He's frustrated," commented aide Richard Garon. "So, too, are many other members of the subcommittee and Congress."

The anti-piracy program, currently in its second year of operation, expires June 21.

---

**MENTAL HEALTH CONFERENCE FOCUSES ON ETHIOPIAN REFUGEES**

A conference on refugee mental health in Washington, D.C., last month highlighted diversity—among "Ethiopians" and among counseling approaches for them.

Information about Ethiopia promotes a remote and exotic image, Ethiopian Community Center Coordinator Yosef Ford suggested. But it generally "fails to communicate the essence and diversity of contemporary Ethiopian social life." Language, religion, and geography have kept distinct more than 75 regional and linguistic groups. Different means of livelihood, family structures, and marriage rules also characterize the population of Ethiopia, which is still 97 percent rural.

There is, however, an overall Ethiopian identity, though this does not imply political unity, Ford said. Every individual
has a clearly defined place in the social structure, formalized in speech and gesture. Sharing food represents a communal lifestyle that contrasts with American individualism and competitiveness.

In his presentation about traditional healing practices, Yeshitila Araya noted that respect for authority figures, including teachers, leaders, and religious leaders, is manifested in reserved and almost fearful behavior. Araya is assistant executive director of Children and Family Services in Baltimore, Maryland.

Refugees "Devastated" but "Strong" Being uprooted from this traditional, formalized culture is particularly painful for refugees from Ethiopia, participants suggested. Refugees in the U.S. were described as "devastated," "emotionally handicapped," "disrupted from their maturing process," and "afraid of losing their past."

All of this is exacerbated for the 6-8,000 refugees and asylum applicants in the U.S., it was suggested, by the fact that they can only get "dead-end" jobs. "[Refugees] are like grown-up babies," one refugee participant said. "They need your emotional support, your ears, everything."

Refugees are also, however, the "strongest survivalist people," said Tedla Giorgis, a clinical psychologist and associate director of the Ethiopian Community Development Center. "They have guts, skill, talent, and tact." Mental health services are needed, not to provide solutions for refugees, but to "reactivate their survival instinct and successes."

Alternate Counseling Approaches Ideally, counseling might be provided by skilled professionals who know the language and culture of their clients. "Common language itself can be a therapeutic tool," Giorgis said.

In Washington, the Andromeda Center can provide such services, though constrained by funding limitations, geographic boundaries, and its mandate to serve only refugees when the larger population in need is those who are awaiting asylum decisions.

Participants debated alternate approaches when such a center is not available. A common language with the client may not be as important as the interpersonal skills and ability to empathize, some suggested, although others maintained a therapist working through an interpreter would have to be very skillful. Kimchi Nguyen of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), which funded the conference, noted that the agency is training bilingual paraprofessionals to "bridge the gap." Networks among service providers might also help locate personnel or centers with appropriate skills and resources.

Workshop Series to Continue Mainstreaming—using publically funded community mental health centers, for example—might be possible, but refugee service providers should be aware of the limited core services and variations in approaches of these locally oriented centers, presenters said.

A participant representing an area school district suggested that constraints force service providers to be creative. "If you're confident you're working for the good of the client, then proceed logically and do the best you can with what's available."

Cross-cultural communication, suicide assessment and intervention, and basic technical psychopathology and diagnostic skills were among the topics of the two-day session. The conference is one of seven to be sponsored by ORR. Sites include New York (May 17-18), Boston (June 14-15), and Los Angeles (July 19-20); other sites have not yet been identified.

Update

- The U.S. Embassy in Sudan has closed down refugee processing in two of the three operational sites in Sudan, according to a U.S. Catholic Conference source in Washington, D.C. USCC, the voluntary agency charged with handling resettlement applications and procedures in Sudan, was instructed to halt processing in Gedaref and Port Sudan indefinitely. The USCC source said that third country resettlement is widely believed to siphon off critical refugee leadership and therefore disrupt local assistance programs in Sudan. But perhaps even more important to U.S. officials, he added, are concerns for regional
stability and preservation of existing pro-
grams. State Department officials could
not be reached for comment about the de-
velopment.

UNHCR reports that 1,650 refugees left
Sudan in 1982, coming mostly to the U.S.
This year, 665,000 refugees--primarily from
Ethiopia--are estimated to be in Sudan,
concentrated in settlements in outlying
areas. The new directive leaves the cap-
ital, Khartoum, as the sole remaining
office that will accept refugee applica-
tions for U.S. resettlement.

* In response to a UN Secretary General
initiative, fourteen African nations have
proposed projects to alleviate the social
and economic burdens of sheltering Africa's
four million or so refugees and returnees.
The 128 projects are valued at $362 million.
Representatives of UN member states and
agencies will gather for a second Interna-
tional Conference on Assistance to Refugees
in Africa (ICARA II) in Geneva July 9-11 to
review the proposed projects, which focus
heavily on sub-Saharan Africa, and offer
their support.

Whereas the first ICARA Conference in
1981 raised substantial funding for emer-
gency relief, the emphasis now is to
strengthen the infrastructural capacity of
receiving countries, as a move toward
lasting solutions.

* Actual admissions for the first half of
FY 84 compared to approved ceilings are
shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>ACTUAL ADMISSIONS 10/83-3/84</th>
<th>FY 84 CEILINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST ASIA</td>
<td>23,867</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR/E. EUROPE</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR EAST/S.ASIA</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIN AMER./CARIB.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of State, Bureau
for Refugee Programs

* The Immigration and Naturalization
Service has authorized continued deferred
departure for Ugandan nationals in the U.S.
who are not willing to return to Uganda.
The decision was announced by INS on May
as a result of concerns expressed to INS
the Department of State in April. Those
granted a deferral, which will be in effect
until October 31, 1984, who "establish
appropriate need" may be authorized work
permission.

INS registered 867 Ugandans as res-
idents in the U.S. in December 1980.

Projects and Programs

CIVIL RIGHTS PROJECT STRESSES ACCESS TO
HEALTH SERVICES

Informed by the Office of Refugee
Resettlement (ORR) in March 1983 that
Southeast Asian refugees were having prob-
lems in obtaining "adequate, equal, and
accessible health care services," the
Office for Civil Rights (OCR) initiated a
project to examine those problems and de-
vote appropriate strategies for correcting
them. According to Helene Bloom, head-
quarters coordinator of the refugee pro-
ject, these problems are of concern to OCR
because they may be violations of Title VI
of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which
prohibits discrimination on the basis of
race, color, or national origin in any
program receiving federal financial
assistance.

Outreach a Key Feature To address problems
largely attributed to language and cultural
barriers, OCR has developed an overall
strategy of voluntary compliance and out-
reach, to work with health care providers,
particularly hospitals, and the refugee
community to improve access to health
services, Bloom said.
The outreach component is designed to
inform voluntary agencies, mutual assis-
tance associations, and refugee leaders
about refugees' rights. Although OCR has
received few discrimination complaints from
the refugee population, several sources
agreed that this was due more to the ref-
ugee community's lack of awareness of their
rights than to a lack of problems.

To increase refugee awareness of their
rights and the services available from OCR,
two brochures have been translated into
Vietnamese, Lao, and Khmer, one on the rights of the disabled and the other on Title VI rights in health and human service programs. They are being distributed to refugee organizations through regional OCR offices.

Bloom said the voluntary compliance program is designed "to educate health care providers so that they can better address refugees' problems and voluntarily comply with civil rights requirements for minorities and the handicapped."

Regional Approaches Vary In each of OCR's ten regional offices, a lead person has been assigned to work with ORR regional coordinators, state refugee coordinators, voluntary agencies, mutual assistance associations, and other refugee groups. Together they will determine the nature of the region's problems and develop specific techniques for dealing with them. Within OCR's overall strategy guidelines, the emphasis of regional projects varies according to need.

Bloom pointed to a Region VI program as a possible model for other projects. After consultation with the regional ORR office, the OCR Region VI office in Dallas decided to concentrate initially on the large county hospitals used by the majority of the area's refugees. Mike Gonzales, regional coordinator for the refugee project, met with officials at Parkland Memorial Hospital in Dallas to plan a training program to meet the hospital staff's need for knowledge about the refugee population.

On April 25, the first training program, "Indochinese Refugee Patient Relations Training," was held, attended by 38 medical and administrative staff and guests from state and voluntary agencies.

According to Gonzales, the training session was a successful trial run. "Because Parkland wanted the program, they provided the staff, facilities, and equipment, so no outside funding was necessary," Gonzales said. He worked closely with Ann Swain, the continuing education coordinator at Parkland Memorial, in planning the session to assure that the training would meet requirements for continuing education credits. Gonzales said qualifying for credit increases the attractiveness of such programs. According to Swain, meeting state criteria for continuing education credits for this kind of program presents no major difficulties.

The session was videotaped for use in future sessions, and participants' evaluations are being used to refine the program. Gonzales anticipates additional programs for the larger Dallas hospital community as well as for Houston and Galveston.

Region VII Goes to Refugee Groups Lorenzo Cervantes, project coordinator in the OCR Region VII office in Kansas City, has concentrated on meeting with refugee groups to discuss their rights and OCR's purpose and to determine the health care access problems specific to the region's refugee communities.

Cervantes said he has found that most problems are due to the language barrier. Refugee communities in the area are relatively small and include refugees of different ethnic and language groups, so it is difficult for hospitals to provide full-time interpreter services, he said. Cervantes learned that refugees in one city travel four to five hours to see a Vietnamese doctor practicing in another city. This summer, Cervantes said, he plans to meet with officials of the region's hospitals to develop possible methods for solving the problems identified.

Other Focuses Possible Bloom said the refugee project has been included in OCR's long-range plans for the next five years. The projects will continue to focus on health care for the next year but may expand to employment, social service, or assistance programs in the future.

For information on the OCR refugee project, or to obtain copies of the civil rights brochures in Vietnamese, Lao, or Khmer, contact regional offices of the Office for Civil Rights or the Office of Refugee Resettlement, or the Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights, 300 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20201, (202) 472-6674.

The next combined issue of Refugee Reports, Numbers 9 and 10, will be published on June 15.
## Statistics

### Asylum Cases Filed with INS District Directors in FY 84-By Nationality

As of March 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY*</th>
<th>Cumulative Received This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Granted This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Denied This FY</th>
<th>Pending End of Month</th>
<th>NATIONALITY*</th>
<th>Cumulative Received This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Granted This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Denied This FY</th>
<th>Pending End of Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13,419</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>13,148</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>LAOS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LIBERIA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>LIBYA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>NICARAGUA</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>8,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>PAKISTAN</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA (MAINLAND)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>PANAMA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PERU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTA RICA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>115,931</td>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>SOMALIA</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6,130</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY-F.D.R.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SRI LANKA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>SURINAME</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5,587</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONDURAS</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>UGANDA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>VIETNAM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>YUGOSLAVIA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMPUCHEA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>STATELESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nationalities with fewer than 10 applications pending are omitted from this chart.
** Other than Hong Kong

SOURCE: Immigration & Naturalization Service

---
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The widespread impression that the U.S. public is solidly opposed to refugee admissions is incorrect, according to a recent study. Representatives Hamilton Fish (R-N.Y.), Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), and Jim Moody (D-Wis.) and the U.S. Committee for Refugees released the findings of a survey of public attitudes about refugees and immigrants early this month.

Sentiment about refugees, and immigrants in general, is complex, and superficial assessments do not reveal Americans' fundamental generosity and openness, speakers at a press conference at the Capitol stated. "Americans are portrayed as 'turned off' to refugees. This is not so," Fish said. "It never has been so."

Public receptivity to refugees increases with knowledge, Fish reported, citing study findings. The implications of the research, then, "present a challenge to political and religious leaders...to achieve improvements [in immigration policies] without compromising our historic principles" of generously providing haven to those fleeing persecution.

The survey was carried out for USCR by Kane, Parsons and Associates, a public opinion and marketing research firm. Seven hundred and fifty adults nationwide were interviewed by telephone in February 1984 in what the researchers described as the most comprehensive and reliable poll yet conducted of attitudes on the subject. A Rockefeller Foundation grant supported the research.

Knowledge about Refugees Scant What distinguished this survey from prior ones, the researchers stated, was its particular focus on refugee questions, as well as the fact that it sought to elicit the importance of refugee issues relative to other issues of national significance.

Compared to unemployment, hunger, and protecting the environment, arrival of refugees in the U.S. "is not a burning issue," USCR Director Roger Winter stated at the press conference.

But it is an issue that causes much confusion, the poll discovered. Ninety-one percent of the survey...
respondents characterized themselves as either not well informed or having no opinion as to whether refugees should be admitted to the U.S.; over half did not relate refugees and their defining characteristic--persecution for political beliefs; and 50 percent mistakenly believed that Mexico is one of the largest sources of refugees coming to the U.S.

This confusion, Winter charged, allows the public to be misled, and policymakers to be convinced that the public opposes refugee admissions. The USCR study suggests, Winter said, that "positive leadership, unfettered by extremism from any side, will find support for enlightened policy on refugee admissions."

**Congressional Leaders State Support**

**Statements by Senators Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.) and Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Representatives Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.), Samuel Gejdenson (D. Conn.), and Walter E. Fauntroy (D-D.C.) expressed strong support for the survey findings. Fauntroy, speaking for the Congressional Black Caucus on Haitian Refugees, said, "[This study] coincides with the high level of support we have received in our defense of the Haitian refugees."

Participating in the press conference, Fish and Moody called for leadership by Congress to educate the public and "set the tone" for responsive admissions policies.

Evident in the congressional statements was attention to the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform bill. On June 11, the House voted to begin a week of debate on the bill. Although current provisions--other than those on adjustment of status of Cuban and Haitian entrants--do not pertain to refugees, Fish and others expressed the hope that the poll findings would allow Congress to have a more accurate picture of public opinion and would contribute to a more informed debate on immigration issues. "[Immigration] is a highly politically charged issue," Fish said, "and this study could cut both ways. I hope the emphasis will be on the values expressed [by survey respondents]. It should be a plus."

**Immigrant, Black Groups Respond**

Joining those offering their support of the USCR findings were 46 associations representing new Americans and refugee communities. "We are challenged," the group wrote, "by the findings that the more knowledge and understanding a person has regarding refugee and immigration issues, the more willing they are to support the kind of generous admissions policies and international assistance which have allowed us to escape persecution." The groups expressed their "special responsibility" to help inform the public about refugees' needs.

Black Americans will support policies of family reunification and providing a haven for refugees, Norman Hill, president of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, said, "If Black leaders make the issue of refugees and immigrants concrete, if our communities can see the flesh-and-blood human beings affected by refugee and immigration policies."

No consistent differences in the opinions of Blacks or Hispanics from those of respondents in the base sample were found in the study.

**Hostile yet Humanitarian**

Hill's comments reflect a major finding of the study, and one which the survey researchers said would require more examination. When asked an abstract question about whether too many foreigners were coming to the U.S., respondents generally agreed. This has been the finding of previous public opinion polls on immigration questions, as well.

However, questions about individual cases will elicit very different responses, USCR Director Winter said. The majority of survey participants said they would admit each of ten hypothetical immigrants whose characteristics were representative of specific types of refugees and other legal immigrants from a variety of countries coming to the U.S. for a variety of reasons.

This apparent contradiction between hostility and humanitarianism may, according to the researchers, reflect different levels of abstraction. "In situations involving people more readily identifiable as individuals, Americans respond with that tradition of generosity and magnanimity that we like to think is part of our national character," the report stated.
A SURVEY OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD REFUGEES AND IMMIGRATION: REPORT OF FINDINGS

On June 8, Representatives Hamilton Fish (R-N.Y.), Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), and Jim Moody (D-Wis.) and the U.S. Committee for Refugees released the findings of a study on public attitudes in the U.S. toward refugees and immigrants. The text of the study report prepared by Kane, Parsons and Associates for USCR is reproduced here. An introduction by the researchers and several tables have been omitted due to limited space. The tables which are included have been renumbered to follow this text. Minor editing has been done, to allow for the omissions.

Importance of Refugees And Other Problems

**FINDING:** Compared to other public policy issues, the American public sees the entry of refugees into the U.S. as one of moderate to low importance.

Questions asked of members of the general public about the salience of various national problems typically find that large proportions of respondents see these issues as important (if they were not, why would anyone bother to ask?) For this reason, a question eliciting the perceived significance of only a single issue is of limited usefulness.

A 1983 survey of Blacks and Hispanics commissioned by the Federation for American Immigration Reform suffers from this deficiency. Among its findings is that majorities of both samples rated immigration to be of above average importance, though the questionnaire did not include any other issues against which these results could be judged.

It is only by comparison with other problems that survey data can be interpreted to provide any meaningful judgments about the importance of public policy issues.

Responses to Question 1 on our survey follow the predicted pattern in that majorities or near majorities of each sample (the base sample, Blacks, and Hispanics) placed each of six public policy issues in the "very important" category. What is more meaningful, however, is the ranking of the issues. "Refugees coming into the United States" is ranked fifth of the six problems, ahead only of "population growth." At the top of the list are "poor people not getting enough to eat" and "unemployment." In sum, it appears that compared to other public policy issues, refugees are seen as an issue of only moderate to low importance.

There are some interesting variations in the importance attached to refugees by sample sub-groups. Less-educated respondents see the entry of refugees as more important than do those with more education, as do Southerners, older respondents, those whose ancestors came to this country before the Civil War, and conservatives.

Awareness of Differences Between Refugees and Immigrants

**FINDING:** Most Americans do not understand the technical difference between refugees and immigrants.

Fifty percent of the base sample say that refugees and immigrants are "people coming into the United States for different purposes and by different means," while the remainder are almost equally distributed between respondents who erroneously describe these words as "just different terms for the same kind of people" and those who admit to not knowing the answer to the question. Not surprising is that educated respondents are more likely to give the correct answer (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Perceptions of Differences Between Terms</th>
<th>&quot;Refugees&quot; and &quot;Immigrants&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Refugees</em> and <em>Immigrants</em> are:</td>
<td>Base Sample</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just different terms for the same kind of people</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People coming into the U.S. for different purposes and by different means</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BASE)</td>
<td>(748)</td>
<td>(99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who correctly answered that refugees and immigrants are not the same were asked to elaborate on these differences. By far the dominant response
(volunteered by 56 percent of those in the base sample who were asked the question) refers to the volition of leaving one's homeland; immigrants are seen as having made this choice voluntarily, while refugees are correctly described as having been forced to leave. Other responses include a diversity of ideas, both valid and inaccurate.

[The report characterizes some of these responses as follows:

- Answers stressing deprivation (e.g., refugees have no home, nowhere to go.)
- Answers stressing legal distinction upon entry (e.g., immigrants are legal, come with our permission; refugees are not legal, they just come without applying.)
- Answers referring to motives for coming to U.S. (e.g., immigrants want to work, refugees do not.)
- Answers stressing abilities, class distinctions (e.g., refugees are lower class; immigrants are higher class)
- Answers referring to the places from which they come (e.g., refugees are from countries or areas at war.)]

It is surprising that few respondents explicitly mention persecution and oppression of refugees.

Self-Judgments As To Knowledge and Opinions About Refugees

FINDING: Only one in eleven members of the adult public is self-described as knowledgeable about refugee issues and having opinions as to how our society should resolve these problems. Two-thirds of those interviewed, in effect, characterize themselves as without opinion as to what policies our country should adopt with respect to refugees.

A question posed to survey participants toward the end of the interview asked them to judge themselves in terms of their knowledge about refugee issues and the extent to which they have opinions about how the problems should be resolved. The most pointed conclusion about the results is the small number (only 9 percent of the base sample) of respondents who describe themselves as both well informed about refugees and having opinions as to what should be done about the issue (see Table 2). Remaining members of the sample are distributed almost equally among the three other responses offered as part of the question: uninformed and without opinions (25 percent); uninformed but nevertheless with opinions (26 percent); and informed but uncertain as to what should be done (36 percent.) In short, two-thirds of the public, in effect, characterize themselves as not having opinions on the issue of refugees, and an additional 26 percent admit that they do not know much about the subject. The two minority oversamples do not differ from the public as a whole on this measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not know enough to really have meaningful opinions on the issues of refugees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not know very much about refugees but does have opinions on these matters</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does know something about refugees but is not sure about what policies our country should adopt</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is well informed about the issue and has opinions about what should be done</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(BASE) (750) (100) (103)

One implication of these results is to call into question the accuracy of the model of an informed, carefully deliberative citizenry traditionally portrayed in high school civics texts, though the discrepancy between the ideal and the real in this context is hardly novel to observers with even a passing acquaintance with American political life.

The more serious problem posed by these results is the extent to and manner in which public opinion should be and is useful in formulating policy with respect to refugee and immigration issues. While it could reasonably be argued that, even if 

spite of this finding, the public's broad preferences are of use to policy makers in
a democratic society, the fact that over 90 percent of the adult population in effect disqualifies itself as a source of informed opinion on the issue effectively circumcribes its role in and relevance to the policy formation process.

Perceptions of Characteristics of Refugees, Legal Immigrants and Undocumented Aliens

FINDINGS: Less than half of the public correctly associates political persecution with refugee status or family reunification with legal immigrants. While failure to fit in American society is most often ascribed to illegal immigrants, it is striking to note that, by more than a five-to-one margin, refugees are seen as more likely being misfits than legal immigrants.

To explore the public's views as to differences between refugees, legal immigrants, and undocumented aliens, respondents were asked which group was best described as "fleeing persecution for their political beliefs;" which as "wanting to come to the U.S. because of better economic opportunities here;" which as "frequently coming to the U.S. to be with family members and close relatives already in the country;" and which as "not tending to fit into American society very well."

The results indicate that it is not as obvious as one might presuppose that refugees are fleeing political oppression: just under half of the base sample correctly associate the two.

The presence of better economic opportunities in the U.S. is seen as motivating legal entrants more so than undocumented aliens, a perception that may seem slightly off the mark, but one that would be difficult to document. In any case, comparatively few persons interviewed attribute this motive mainly to refugees.

Not quite half of each sample correctly attributes family reunification as a motive of legal immigrants more so than of other entrants. Consistently observed in this and other items on this subject is that Blacks and Hispanics are of basically the same views as the public generally.

The last item ("don't tend to fit into American society very well") differs from the other three in that it provides the greatest opportunity for respondents to project their own values and biases into their answers; even an expert would be hard pressed to give an objective answer. For this reason, the results it elicits are especially interesting. The condition is most often attributed to illegal immigrants (though Hispanics apply it to refugees slightly more frequently), a finding possibly explained by the association of the two clearly undesirable qualities of not fitting in and illegality. The most informative finding in view of the emphasis of this research on refugees, though, is the much greater extent to which refugees are seen as misfits than are other legal immigrants.

Better educated and younger respondents are more likely to associate political persecution with refugee status. The tendency to see legal immigrants as motivated by economic considerations is disproportionately concentrated among the better educated, younger members of the public, and those whose ancestors arrived in this country after World War I. Correctly associating family reunification with legal immigrants is correlated with higher education, living in the Northeast, having ancestors who immigrated after World War I, professing the Catholic faith, and being "non-Democrat." It is also surprising that there are few differences in how respondents with varying demographic characteristics answer the question about fitting in American society. Younger respondents are more likely to view refugees as misfits, though there are no differences on other background measures, including education.

Perceptions of the Numbers of Types of Persons Entering the U.S.

FINDING: Fewer than one in five respondents is correct in thinking that the number of refugees entering the country over the last ten years is smaller than either illegal immigrants or persons entering the country by other legal means.

Given the controversy and uncertainties surrounding undocumented aliens, there is perhaps little point in trying to make definitive statements in this document as to whether there are more legal or illegal immigrants entering the country each year. The public's perception, though, is that, by a four-to-one margin, illegal immigrants...
are more frequent than those with papers.

One conclusion that can be reached with reasonable certainty, however, is that the number of refugees entering the country over the last ten years has averaged less than either the number of illegal entrants or other immigrants entering legally. Public opinion is at variance with these facts, as only 18 percent of the base sample correctly identified refugees as the third largest of these three types of entrants. A slight majority (62 percent) thinks that legal immigrants are fewest in number. The views of the two minority oversamples reflect those of the public-at-large. As would be expected, the probability of a correct answer to this series of questions increases as the educational level of the respondent does, though a majority of even college graduates continues to give wrong answers—only 30 percent correctly put refugees in third place, as compared to 14 percent of those with no more than a high school diploma.

Perceptions of Countries From Which Refugees Come to the U.S.

FINDING: Substantial misperceptions exist with respect to where refugees come from, as evidenced by the findings that more are seen as coming from Mexico than each of eight other countries and that few refugees are thought to have come from the Soviet Union.

Continuing our exploration of public understanding of refugee and related issues is a series of items asking survey participants to indicate from which countries refugees entering the U.S. come. Given the confusion in the minds of many persons over the distinctions between different types of persons entering this country documented thus far in this report, it is, at this point, not surprising that the question uncovered further misperceptions. Thus, Mexico, perhaps the leading source of undocumented aliens in this country but not a source of refugees, is most often cited as one of the countries from which the largest number of refugees come (50 percent of the base sample). Only two other countries, Cuba and Vietnam, are seen by substantial numbers of respondents as major sources of refugees. Since over 400,000 Vietnamese have been admitted since 1975, the latter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries from which Refugees Are Seen as Coming to the United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of largest*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Base) (750) (100) (103)

*Response categories are as follows:

Is one of the countries from which the largest number of refugees come to the United States

A substantial number of refugees come here from that country but not enough to be one of the largest sources

Few or no refugees come to the United States from that country.
judgment is an accurate one, while the indeterminate status of the 1980 Mariel Cubans by even the federal government's standards could be seen as a justification for placing Cuba near the top on this measure.

Perhaps the other notable example of an inaccurate perception is that so few persons see the Soviet Union as sending a sizable number of refugees to the U.S. (70 percent say it has sent few or none)—a surprising finding in view of the considerable debate and publicity surrounding policy with respect to Soviet Jews in the 1970s and 1980s (see Table 3).

If one accepts the conclusion that most members of the public do not properly differentiate between various types of persons entering the United States, then a plausible interpretation of the data is that what the question is actually measuring is the perception of the number of entrants of all types coming from these countries. From this perspective, the ordering of the countries in the table is more accurate.

An Index of Knowledge About Refugees and Immigration For analytical purposes, each respondent was scored according to the number of correct answers he or she gave on eight factual items from different points in the questionnaire. In response to the question about descriptions of refugees and legal and illegal immigrants, for example, respondents who said refugees are fleeing persecution for their political beliefs are considered correct; all other responses are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all other responses are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all others are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all others are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all others are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all others are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all others are incorrect. Respondents identifying legal immigrants as frequently coming to the United States to be with family members and close relatives already in this country are considered correct; all others are incorrect.

Each survey participant was given a score corresponding to the number of items answered correctly. Scores were low, as the average respondent answered fewer than three of the eight items correctly.

As expected, better educated respondents have higher scores on the knowledge index, and younger ones also show better results. There is a tendency for respondents whose ancestors arrived more recently to be more knowledgeable, though the difference is slight. Perhaps equally as interesting as these results are the null findings of no relation between knowledge and religious background, political ideology, and party identification. Finally, we observe that there is a positive relation between actual score on the knowledge index and how respondents rate themselves on the knowledge-opinions typology, though the strength of the association is only moderate.

General Attitudes Toward Refugees and Other Immigrants Entering the Country

FINDINGS: Two-thirds of the public agrees that too many foreigners are coming into the U.S. to stay these days. Consistent with these sentiments is the majority judgment that the numbers of admitted refugees and illegal immigrants should be reduced. A plurality endorses maintaining the quota of other legal immigrants at current levels, though on balance opinion tends more toward reducing rather than increasing numbers of entrants.

Educated members of the public show consistently more tolerant attitudes on these issues than their less well-educated peers. Similarly, more pro-immigrant attitudes are found among persons more knowledgeable about the issues.

Of five possible arguments for admitting refugees, appeal to our history as a nation of immigrants wins the most support among the public. On the other hand, the fear that refugees take jobs away from Americans elicits the most exclusionary reaction.

We turn in this section away from factual issues toward the normative and attitudinal substance that accounts for a good proportion of the questionnaire. An early question (asked before it was
apparent to participants that the survey was focused almost exclusively on immigration issues) shows that about two-thirds of each sample agrees that there are too many foreigners coming to the U.S. these days. Noteworthy about these answers is the skewed nature of the results, with about half the samples falling in the "agree strongly" category.

There are interesting and appreciable differences in how various subgroups of the sample responded to this question. While there are no differences according to sex, less educated respondents are much more likely to agree strongly with the proposition (57 percent as compared to 20 percent of college graduates). Anti-foreign sentiment is also disproportionately found in the South, among older respondents, among those with roots in this country going back further in time, among Protestants, and among self-described political conservatives, though there is no association between political party identification and attitudes on the issue.

Especially interesting is the contrast in the answers of those who are more and less knowledgeable about immigration issues: 59 percent of the respondents with low scores on the knowledge index agree strongly that there are too many foreigners entering, as compared to only 24 percent of those in the high-score category. On the other hand, respondent self-ratings as to knowledge and opinions on the issues show no correlation with attitudes toward immigrants.

Finally, we note the large differences on this attitudinal measure--almost 40 percentage points--between those who think that the influx of refugees into the U.S. is a very important problem and those rating it as less important.

As would be expected, there are more favorable attitudes toward legal than illegal immigrants. Fully 78 percent of the base sample prefers that the number of persons entering the country illegally be lowered "a lot," compared to a much smaller 18 percent rendering a similar judgment with respect to those coming legally. While the modal position with respect to legal entrants is maintenance of the status quo (44 percent of the base sample), opinion toward even this group is, on balance, more negative than positive as evidenced by the much larger number who support reducing the number of immigrants than increasing them (40 percent say lowered, as compared to only 9 percent in favor of increases). The data also show a greater tendency to exclude people thought of as "refugees" than those labelled "legal immigrants;" whereas 40 percent of the public wants to decrease the number of legal immigrants, 62 percent voices a similar judgment with respect to refugees.

Our study analyzed how respondents in selected subsamples feel about the number of refugees to be admitted to the country (see Table 4). Notable differences in attitudes correspond to differences in education (educated citizens show more tolerance for refugees); actual knowledge about immigration (the better informed one is, the more likely he or she is to favor admitting refugees); and perceptions as to the importance of refugees entering the country (members of the public who regard the issue as most important give anti-refugee responses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Admission of Refugees By Sample Subgroup (Base sample only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of refugees coming into the U.S. each year should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score on Knowledge Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance attached to refugees coming into the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reactions to various reasons for and against admitting refugees are documented in Table 5, where the eight arguments included in the question have been listed in order of decreasing persuasiveness with respect to allowing in this type of entrant. None of the five statements supporting refugee admissions is endorsed by a majority of the public. The first
item in the table ("Since the U.S. is a nation built by immigrants, we should not close our doors now to people fleeing persecution in other countries") is the only one with a plurality (42 percent)

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By taking in refugees, the United States demonstrates its moral leadership of the free world.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Willingness to admit refugees is strong.**

### Proof of our humanitarian values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Many refugees admitted to the United States in recent decades have made significant contributions to America's economic and cultural life.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Since the number of refugees coming into the United States is small compared to the total size of our country, they don't place a substantial burden on our society.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refugees don't assimilate into American society well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Most refugees admitted to the United States wind up on welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refugees take jobs away from American workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Base Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a good reason not to let in refugees</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good reason for admitting refugees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true, but has no relevance</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not true</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

endorsing it as a justification for letting in refugees. On the other hand, only one of the five arguments on behalf of refugee admissions is judged not true by a substantial minority—36 percent—of the population ("Since the number of refugees coming into the U.S. is small compared to the total size of our country, they don't place a substantial burden on our society").

Of the three arguments opposing the entry of refugees, only one is endorsed by a slight majority of survey participants (52 percent agree that "refugees take jobs away from American workers" is a valid reason to oppose their admission). Almost as many (45 percent) feel that refugees should not be allowed in because "most wind up on welfare," although poor assimilation is not seen by many as a reason for refusing to let refugees enter the country. The public's feelings toward refugees are also revealed by the finding that each of these three anti-refugee arguments is implicitly endorsed as true by a majority of the sample.

For example, 34 percent judge "refugees don't assimilate into American society well" as true but of no relevance as to whether they should be admitted, and 26 percent say this is a good reason not to let in refugees—a total of 60 percent acknowledging the argument as true. Similar calculations show majorities endorsing the other two statements as true.

The complete computer tabulations show that subsample differences on these items are similar to those previously reported. That is, more educated respondents are more likely to endorse the five pro-refugee arguments as reasons for admitting refugees and less likely to agree with the logic behind the statements opposing admission of refugees. Similar findings are observed for persons most knowledgeable about refugee issues and for respondents who do not think refugees coming into the U.S. is a very important problem. Other subsamples show smaller and/or less consistent differences.

### Judgments About Who Should Be Admitted to the U.S.

**FINDING:** Majorities of the public felt that each of ten hypothetical applicants should be allowed to enter the U.S.
The preceding section of this report discussed attitudes toward refugees and other immigrants measured as general social categories. The line of questioning reported in this section, while again examining attitudes towards persons entering the country, is considerably less abstract in that the question focuses on specific types of persons with recognizable human characteristics and problems—with surprisingly different results.

The respondent was asked to imagine that he or she was a U.S. government official with the job of deciding who should and should not be admitted into this country. Ten hypothetical cases were presented to each respondent using the descriptions contained in Table 6. The first and most remarkable conclusion is that majorities of the public think that each of the ten applicants should be allowed to enter the country, a finding notably at variance with the appreciably more hostile attitudes documented previously. Respondents with college degrees and those who are more knowledgeable about immigration again reveal the more tolerant attitudes shown throughout this report.

While each of the ten applicants is accepted by a majority of respondents, the proportion favoring admission varies from a high of 82 percent ("a man from England who wants to come to the United States to be with this daughter who immigrated here ten years ago") to a slight majority of 52 percent (the Polish factory worker afraid of re-prisal for involvement in Solidarity).

Among the hypotheses that could be formulated on the basis of the rank order of the results in Table 6 is that family reunification (a major consideration in this country's present system of admitting non-refugee legal immigrants) is more persuasive to respondents than the desire to come to the U.S. to start a new life; the first and third ranked items both involve family reunification, whereas the two applicants wanting to start new lives fall in the eighth and ninth places. We do not see any particular sympathy for those fleeing communism, as the three cases referring directly or indirectly to communist governments are spread throughout the list (the Soviet Jew in second place, the Vietnamese "boat person" in seventh place, and the Polish Solidarity member occupying the last-ranked position). Finally, we do not observe any bias toward the country's WASPish beginnings; compare the similar performance of the two applicants, one from England (ranked first) and the other from Taiwan (ranked third), who want to join daughters here, or look at the nearly identical results for a Mexican and an Englishman who want to start life anew in this country (rated eighth and ninth respectively).

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s Judgments as to Who Should Be Admitted to the United States</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A man from England who wants to come to the United States to be with this daughter who immigrated here ten years ago</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew from the Soviet Union facing persecution because he is Jewish</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man from Taiwan who wants to come to the United States to be with his daughter who immigrated here ten years ago</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Iranian student wants to be allowed to stay here permanently. He fears he will most certainly be shot if he goes home because of his past opposition to the present government</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man from El Salvador comes from a town in which many people were killed by fighters from both sides of that country's civil war. He fears that if he is forced to return to El Salvador he will be in great danger</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with job skills very much in demand in the United States</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Vietnamese who fled that country by boat after being persecuted for his past association with the U.S. policy</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man from Mexico who wants to start a new life in this country</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man from England who wants to start a new life for himself in this country</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A former factory worker from Poland who was active in that country's Solidarity movement seeking liberalization of the communist regime. Although he will be in no physical danger if he returns to Poland, he may never get a job there because of his past political activity</td>
<td>should be admitted</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Base) (750) (100) (103)
Half of the ten hypothetical applicants possess attributes usually associated with refugee status or with people seeking asylum (the Soviet Jew, the Iranian student, the Salvadoran, the Vietnamese, and the Polish factory worker). Given the earlier finding of a greater tendency of respondents to favor reducing the number of entrants labelled "refugees" than "legal immigrants," we might expect that respondents would be less prone to admit these persons than those more closely resembling the typical immigrant to this country. The results in Table 6, though, show no systematic differences in how these five are treated in comparison to other would-be immigrants, as they appear throughout the rank order rather than being clustered at either end of the table. Among the possible interpretations of this result is that the comparatively greater antagonism towards refugees is more show than substance, that people are reacting more to the semantics of the questions than to factual considerations. Thus one might argue that the connotations of the word "refugee" (the outcast, downtrodden, dispossessed etc.) are more disparaging than the images usually associated with immigrants and thus lead to the above-noted difference.

Public opinion research on other topics has often uncovered discrepancies in how people react to issues phrased differently. Thus, virtually all Americans endorse basic civil liberties in the abstract, but many are willing to deny freedom of speech, etc. in specific circumstances to individuals or organizations, such as communists or atheists, outside the political and cultural mainstream. The results of this section of our survey are similar in that they underscore the differences in responses depending upon the level of generality of the question. Especially intriguing about these attitudes toward immigration and refugees, though, is that the public is less tolerant at the more abstract level, and shows great receptivity as situations become more specific. It is suggested in the summary and conclusions section of this report that Americans respond much more positively to real-life situations involving identifiable individuals than to general arguments using abstract categories of persons.

The Relation Between Attitudes Toward Immigration and Other Policy Issues

FINDING: Majorities of respondents favor federally guaranteed jobs, prayer in public school, and quotas on foreign imports, while opinions are about equally divided on the proper size of the defense budget.

Hostility to refugees and immigrants is correlated with the perception of a serious communist threat, with support for import quotas, and with endorsement of prayer in public schools. The associations between attitudes toward immigrants and economic issues are appreciably weaker.

The questionnaire included attitudinal measures toward four issues seemingly unrelated to immigration—federal government job guarantees, prayer in public schools, the use of quotas on imported products, and defense spending. Our motive in including these items is not so much to know what people think about these issues as objects of interest in their own right as it is to explore the relation between attitudes toward immigration and those with respect to other important policy areas that are in the public arena.

As expected, there are reasonably strong positive correlations between various items measuring attitudes toward immigration and refugees. Thus members of the sample who agree that there are too many foreigners coming into the U.S. also tend to attach a greater importance to the problem of refugees and to favor sharp reductions in the number allowed into the country.

More surprising are the moderately strong correlations between attitudes toward immigration and three other issue areas: import quotas, school prayer, and the threat of communism. Thus respondents with less tolerant attitudes toward immigrants tend also to favor imposing quotas on foreign products, to support allowing prayer in public schools, and to perceive a greater danger from communism.

Some of the null findings are equally interesting. There is no correlation between attitudes toward immigration and either population growth or environmental dangers. Similarly, attitudes toward immigration and refugees generally show weak or null correlations with items
measuring the importance of unemployment or poor people not getting enough to eat, or federal job guarantees. (One exception is that persons who think there are too many foreigners entering the country are slightly more likely to favor federal job guarantees.)

A related finding is the lack of any consistent correlations between attitudes toward refugees and either self-described political ideology (e.g., conservative, moderate, liberal) or political party identification. The latter two measures, long considered essential components of the political scientist's analytical concepts, do correlate well with several other attitudinal measures, especially those referring to economic issues.

The message of the analysis of this section--necessarily a limited and tentative one in view of the very small number of items that could be accommodated in the survey instrument--is that attitudes toward immigration do not seem to be related to the traditional economic concerns that have been the focus of much policy debate in this country for the last several decades (this despite the fear noted in this study that refugees take jobs away from Americans). Similarly, they are not associated with the traditional political cleavages of party affiliation or the fundamental left-right continuum.

On the other hand, what we do find is a relation between a world view hostile to refugees and one that is apparently distrustful of things foreign and that reacts with alarm to the increasing secularization of society.

Summary and Conclusions The principal findings of this survey can be readily summarized. First, refugee and immigration issues are not viewed as especially important problems facing the country when compared to other topics on the nation's agenda. There is also ample evidence that most American adults have a very incomplete understanding of the issues that have formed the core of this study. Thus fewer than half of those polled can correctly explain the difference between refugees and immigrants; most are not aware of the relative magnitude of the numbers of refugees, legal immigrants, and undocumented aliens entering the country; and there are widespread misperceptions as to the countries from which refugees come. Furthermore, members of the public readily acknowledge their lack of both information on these issues and firm opinions about how to deal with the problems; only one in eleven respondents is self-described as knowledgeable about the issues and having opinions about what should be done.

This survey corroborates the findings of previous efforts in that it documents an initial hostility towards refugees and, to a lesser extent, towards immigrants generally. Thus, almost two-thirds of those questioned feel both that too many foreigners are now coming to the U.S. and that the number of refugees entering the country should be lowered. Consistent with these largely negative attitudes is the result that none of five arguments in favor of admitting refugees is endorsed by a majority of the public. The most oft-cited reason for opposing the admission of refugees is concern that they will take jobs away from Americans.

However, probing beyond this initial antagonism towards immigrants (an exercise largely lacking in earlier polls on the subject) uncovers attitudes that mitigate this portrait of an unsympathetic and uncaring public. Specifically, majorities of the public endorse admitting each of ten imaginary individuals whose profiles match those of typical entrants to this country, both refugees and other types of legal immigrants. While the available space in the questionnaire does not permit an explanation of these seemingly contradictory results of hostility and humanitarianism, the findings do suggest the necessity of a revision in our understanding of how the public views these issues. Perhaps these differences are rooted in the varying levels of abstraction of the questions.

Thus, one could hypothesize that, when faced with relatively abstract questions about groups or classes of persons without specific individuality (such as refugees), most people react negatively and in keeping with what few unfavorable stereotypes and attitudes they have toward these types of people. On the other hand, this line of reasoning suggests that, in situations involving people more readily identifiable as individuals, Americans respond with that tradition of generosity and magnanimity.
that we like to think is part of our national character.

Regardless of whatever argument best explains these findings, the results do document that public opinion on these issues is not nearly so straightforward and simply characterized as depicted in most previous research. A corollary to this conclusion is the observation that one could easily construct a questionnaire to support either side of the debate over refugees. An instrument consisting solely of general questions about refugees would show majority opposition, while one focused on the problems of real-life case histories would lead to the opposite conclusions.

For the most part, the data show few differences between demographic groups. Blacks and Hispanics, which were explicitly oversampled in the project, show no consistent differences with regard to either their understanding of or attitudes toward these issues. Much the same comments can be made for other demographic categories such as sex, region of residence, age, when the respondent's ancestors came to this country, religion, political ideology or party identification. A notable, though not unexpected, exception is education. Well-educated respondents are not only more knowledgeable about the issues, they also show consistently more tolerant and open attitudes toward refugees and immigrants. Paralleling this finding is that persons who are more knowledgeable about these issues are decidedly less hostile towards refugees and immigrants. The latter result suggests that, to the extent it would increase general understanding of refugees and immigrants, a public information campaign would lead to greater receptivity and tolerance of them in our society.

The results of this survey show that considerable revisions are necessary in our ideas about how the public views and understands refugee and immigration issues. To that extent, they should be taken into account by those persons directly involved in immigration reform.

Refugee Reports will continue publication on a monthly basis through the summer. Issue dates are as follows:
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In the next issue, we will include a reader survey form to gather your opinions on a number of questions, including frequency of publication and various optional formats. This is part of a larger assessment of information vehicles about refugees, to be concluded this summer. Your views will be very important to us—so please plan to respond promptly.
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REFUGEE ACT REAUTHORIZATION BILL AMENDED BY SENATE COMMITTEE

On June 14, the Senate Judiciary Committee acted to remove legislative language making voluntary agencies "legally and financially responsible" for refugees' basic needs during their first 90 days in the U.S. The Senate version of the Refugee Act Reauthorization would also authorize refugee program funding through FY 86, adding a year to the House version. Provision of presumptive medical assistance eligibility for the first year for all refugees, as provided in the House version, would also be deleted in the Senate version.

Judiciary Committee approval by voice vote of the amendments to the House bill followed a June 12 mark-up by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy. At that session, the subcommittee approved several amendments agreed upon in a compromise between Senators Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.), chairman, and Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), ranking minority member. The compromise was prompted by significant opposition to several of the House provisions, especially voluntary agency opposition to the Lungren Amendment.

Compromise Deletes Controversial Amendment. The Lungren amendment in the House bill stipulated that resettlement agencies in the House bill stipulated that resettlement agencies would be "legally and financially responsible" for meeting refugees' basic needs for food, clothing, and shelter during their first 90 days in the U.S. The House's stated intention was to increase voluntary agency accountability and bring pressure to bear on the volags to increase efforts to discourage welfare dependency.

At the mark-up, Sen. Simpson introduced a substitute amendment which would require each voluntary agency "to fulfill its responsibility" to provide for the basic needs of each refugee resettled, to develop a plan for the early employment of each refugee, and to monitor implementation of the plan for up to one year after the refugee's admission to the U.S.

Sen. Kennedy, noting the "extraordinary contribution that voluntary agencies have made," agreed that the substitute would achieve more careful monitoring of volag activity "without the offensiveness of the Lungren Amendment."
Although offers were made to work out solutions to what was described by Capitol Hill sources as the very limited vulnerability to lawsuits that the 90-day requirement would have imposed on the agencies, volags remained unified in their opposition. This, according to sources, was the key element in the decision to delete the Lungren Amendment and avoid a "messy Senate fight" in spite of support for the amendment by Sen. Simpson and the administration.

The Senate substitute for the Lungren Amendment, sources suggest, also reflected staff thinking that the House version's 90-day period of accountability was too short, and that State Department contracts with voluntary agencies should be worked out and enforced without the inflexibility legislated provisions would cause.

**Line Item for Targeted Assistance Eliminated**

Another amendment deletes the House provision of $50 million for targeted assistance. Sen. Simpson said this deletion changes nothing, since the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) is already authorized to provide such grants and has assured the subcommittee that it will continue to allocate funds for targeted assistance. According to Dick Day, chief counsel to the refugee subcommittee, ORR has said that targeted assistance was viewed as an emergency program and did not need to be institutionalized by a line item in the reauthorization bill.

Targeted assistance was funded at a level of $82.5 million for FY 83 and again for FY 84 under the continuing resolution which has provided funding for refugee programs the last two years. ORR's budget request for targeted assistance for FY 85 is $19.4 million, reflecting the administration's desire to phase out targeted assistance, according to Shing Jew, budget analyst at ORR. He confirmed that the Senate version would have no effect since the authority for appropriations for targeted assistance already exists.

Jew asserted that the crisis brought about by the enormous influx of Cuban and Haitian entrants and Southeast Asian refugees in 1980 has passed. Since the crisis provided the rationale for targeted assistance, ORR believes the program should now begin to be phased out, he said.

According to sources, states and localities strongly oppose the deletion of authorization for targeted assistance funding. The National Governors Association's position is that the provision must be in the final bill. Their concern is over targeted assistance funding beyond the FY 85 funds which ORR has promised; they reject the argument that because refugee flows are down from earlier emergency levels, targeted assistance should be phased out. The uneven impact on certain localities will remain significant as long as there is no workable placement policy and no effective tracking of secondary migration, sources said.

**Senate Version Drops Presumptive Medical Assistance for Refugees**

Medical assistance for one year for all refugees, without a test of financial need, would also be eliminated in the compromise reached by Sens. Simpson and Kennedy. Sen. Simpson emphasized that the goal of this House provision—to encourage employment and self-sufficiency by separating cash and medical assistance—was commendable, but said that it was unfair to other needy people.

In an interview with *Refugee Reports*, Day pointed out that, even during heated debate at the height of U.S. unemployment a few years ago, the requirement to meet a needs standard in order to receive medical aid was not eliminated for citizens. He stated that refugees have special needs, but added that a program would have to be acceptable to the general population.

"When people perceive newcomers getting more than citizens get, in any country, it can offend the rest of the population. This kind of thing is counterproductive to a generous refugee program," Day said.

Jerry Tinker, minority counsel, said the subcommittee felt that the demonstration projects mandated by the Fish Amendment could deal with the goal of separating cash and medical assistance. The Fish Amendment gives the secretary of Health and Human Services responsibility for developing pilot projects that provide refugee support "in a manner that encourages self-sufficiency, reduces welfare dependency, and fosters greater coordination among the resettlement agencies and service providers. This amendment was not changed by the Senate subcommittee."
Other Changes Made in Reauthorization Bill

Instead of prohibiting block grant reimbursements to states for refugee resettlement programs as the House bill did, the Senate version prohibits block grants only during the term of this reauthorization and allows block grants to be used in states which request them.

The Senate version also deletes a House provision to transfer ORR from the Social Security Administration to the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) and refugee education assistance from HHS to the Department of Education. The administration opposed the legislation of these moves, and the Senate subcommittee agreed that such transfers should be done administratively if needed.

Annual audits of voluntary agency activity by the Government Accounting Office and additional reporting requirements for voluntary agencies included in the House bill were also deleted by the subcommittee.

Action Expected after Democratic Convention

Senate consideration of the Refugee Act reauthorization is expected when Congress reconvenes on July 23. The Judiciary Committee's report on the bill will be filed during the current recess, which began June 29. Tinker, calling it a good compromise, expressed the hope that the House would accept the Senate version so that a conference would be unnecessary. At the June 12 mark-up meeting, Sen. Kennedy said, "I hope we will get early action on this legislation. [The extension of the Refugee Act] will result in a sense of stability and predictability which I think is important to the interested groups."

Recent Developments

COORDINATOR HOLDS WHITE HOUSE HEARING ON FY 85 REFUGEE ADMISSIONS LEVELS

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies (ACVA) proposed an overall refugee admission ceiling of 79,500 for FY 85, not including orderly departure program (ODP) arrivals from Vietnam. The proposal was made in testimony to U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs Eugene Douglas at a White House hearing on June 11, the first to beheld in this summer's consultation process.

Supported by statements from several of its member agencies and other organizations, ACVA recommended maintaining the FY 85 ceiling for Southeast Asia at the same FY 84 level of 50,000. ACVA urged the U.S. to maintain this level of admissions in order to "be in a strong moral position to induce other governments to do more."

ACVA also called for unlimited ODP admissions, stating, "The acceptance of Amerasian children, family reunion cases, and Vietnamese still held in jails and camps because of the close former association with the United States or the government with which we were allied has always had the strong support of the Congress and the American people."

Ceilings for the Near East and South Asia, Africa, and Latin America should be increased for FY 85, ACVA stated. They added that an increase in the Near East and South Asia ceiling to 9,000 from this year's 6,000 would allow resettlement for many urban Afghan refugees "eking out [a miserable existence] in the crowded quarters of Pakistan's and India's cities" and for the growing numbers of Iranian refugees.

Other Increases Suggested

In recommending an increase in Africa's ceiling from 3,000 to 4,000, ACVA rejected the argument that the U.S. has admitted fewer refugees from Africa because Black Americans are not supportive of such admissions. The "utterly untenable situation" of the urban Ethiopian refugees in Djibouti was pointed out.

The role of the U.S. in the upheavals in Central America was cited as one reason to increase the ceiling for Latin America from 1,000 to 2,500, the number that Canada has established for its Latin American quota.

The current ceiling of 12,000 for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union should remain the same for FY 85, ACVA suggested.

The final component of ACVA's overall admissions proposal was a reserve pool of 2,000 for possible emergencies or shortages of available numbers in areas which will have ceilings.

U.S. Leadership is Urged

In other testimony, Roger Winter of the U.S. Committee for Refugees proposed that 10,000 admission slots be set aside for Vietnamese political
prisoners and their families, in addition to the regular ceiling for Southeast Asia. The Vietnamese government has offered to release these prisoners from re-education camps if the U.S. and other countries will accept them for resettlement. While the U.S. has said they would accept them, necessary preconditions have become obstacles to progress, Winter said. "We believe a new initiative by the U.S. is needed to put Hanoi's offer to the test and perhaps achieve a long-overdue breakthrough."

The American Jewish Committee (AJC) urged a return to the 90,000-100,000 level of refugee admissions of a few years ago. The AJC statement noted that the world refugee population is not declining and that standards of protection have eroded. Pointing to the U.S. position of leadership, AJC argued, "An increased refugee admissions ceiling for 1985 would demonstrate not only our determination to meet current needs but also our commitment to future reception of people fleeing oppression...[and] would have positive international effects."

The administration's budget request for FY 85 includes funding for the admission of 72,000 refugees, generating speculation that that will be the government's admission ceiling. The ceiling for FY 84 is 72,000.

MEETING STRESSES NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY AND PLANNING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA REFUGEE PROGRAM

A May 29 meeting in Hong Kong of U.S. government and voluntary agency officials concerned with refugees in Southeast Asia focused on problems in the U.S. refugee program in the region and the need for cooperation to meet changing circumstances.

Participants at the meeting included representatives from U.S. voluntary agencies, the State Department, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, State Department country refugee coordinators, and joint voluntary agency representatives (JVARS).

One issue raised was that of numbers needed for direct departures. Program reports from the JVARS reflected a concern that the number of refugees eligible for direct departure to the U.S. has been exceeding the number authorized by the State Department.

Refugee program policy has been to move certain refugees—unaccompanied minors, aged, and special medical or humanitarian cases—directly to the U.S. without requiring six months in a refugee processing center (RPC) for English training and cultural orientation. According to Bob DeVecchi of the International Rescue Committee, who was at the Hong Kong meeting, almost all of the camps in the region have more people in these categories than there are numbers allotted. In May 1984, there were over 500 refugees eligible for direct departure and only 160 slots authorized for the month in the posts for which data were available (Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, and the Phillipines; Indonesia, Singapore, and ODP not included).

STATE SEEPS LESS FLEXIBILITY

State Department officials said that there is less flexibility this year and a greater need to follow monthly schedules for movement of refugees from Southeast Asia because, for the first time, U.S. admissions from that region are expected to reach approved ceilings.

In fact, to ensure adequate admissions numbers for the rest of the year, the State Department has asked Congress for permission to transfer 2,000 to the Southeast Asia ceiling from areas of the world not expected to reach their FY 84 ceilings. (See Updates, this issue.)

The problem with increasing direct departures, said Margaret Barnhart, chief of the Refugee Admissions Division in the Bureau for Refugee Programs, another participant in the May 29 meeting, is that it would force reductions in the number allowed to leave the RPCs for the U.S., resulting in too many RPC graduates waiting for departure. This, in turn, would restrict the number of new arrivals in the RPCs, leaving planned classes empty and further disrupting the processing schedule. The State Department has attempted to limit the number bypassing training to no more than 10 percent, Barnhart said.

CONCERN ABOUT ODP AND AMERASIANS AIRED

Another topic of discussion was the Order Departure Program and, in particular, the processing of Amerasians still in Vietnam. The dependence of this program on Vietnamese officials has made it difficult to plan
movement, State Department officials said. As Vietnam has recently allowed more to leave under the ODP, meeting participants discussed ways to insure that departure will be possible for all that are eligible.

Barnhart said that a small increase in available admissions numbers for Southeast Asia would be adequate even if Vietnam further increases the number approved to leave during the rest of FY 84. For FY 85, according to Barnhart, the State Department is considering including a separate admission ceiling for ODP in the Coordinator's recommendation to Congress.

Concerns were also expressed about the population of refugees assigned the P-6 priority, the lowest of the six categories that the U.S. will accept for resettlement. There is currently a freeze on processing refugees in this category who arrived in camps after April 30, 1982. Voluntary agency representatives requested the cut-off date be changed to allow processing of more refugees in the P-6 category, but State Department and INS officials agreed that it would be inappropriate to do so unless there is certainty that FY 84 ceilings will be met and no lack of P-1 through P-5 cases. "This would not be in keeping with U.S. policy of trying to help those in greatest need," Barnhart said. She also cited evidence suggesting that the cut-off of processing of P-6 cases is having some deterrent effect on boat departures from Vietnam.

INS Processing Guidelines Reviewed Participants reported that the INS processing guidelines instituted in August 1983 "have by-and-large been helpful and effective, a notable breakthrough," said DeVecchi. INS Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Refugees, Asylum, and Parole, Jean Lujan, announced that INS officers and refugee coordinators have been asked to solicit the views of the JVARs and to report on the effectiveness of the guidelines as part of an evaluation taking place this summer. If warranted by the findings, a report and revisions in the guidelines would follow.

One exception to the otherwise positive evaluation of the processing guidelines' impact was Hong Kong, where, according to Dale de Haan of Church World Service, the guidelines were not implemented very well. Concern was also voiced over the fate of some Vietnamese refugees in Japan, most of them boat people rescued at sea and taken there. Because Japan has offered them "firm resettlement," U.S. policy is that they should stay there unless there are strong reasons for them to come to the U.S. However, because Japan's offer is somewhat conditional, carrying the provision that refugees will not be allowed to become citizens, the voluntary agencies have appealed the cases of some who have relatives in the U.S. Many of the 7,600 refugees in Japan have not requested resettlement, but the U.S. holds that it has been offered and, thus, has denied the volag appeals. State Department officials agreed to investigate the cases mentioned at the meeting.

Jubilee Camp "Appalling" Meeting participants visited the Jubilee Refugee Camp in Hong Kong and agreed that the conditions there were appalling, de Haan reported. The State Department brought the matter to the attention of UNHCR.

Other business at the May 29 meeting included the confirmation of the transfer of the INS District Director's office from Hong Kong to Bangkok; a decision that the State Department and INS would review policy to resolve confusion about the definition and processing procedures for unaccompanied minors; and a review of progress of internationalization of the refugee program. Fewer and fewer countries are accepting refugees from the camps in Southeast Asia for resettlement, making attempts to apply to those countries a somewhat hollow exercise, according to DeVecchi.

HOUSE PASSES SIMPSON-MAZZOLI IMMIGRATION BILL

After seven days of debate, the House of Representatives passed its version of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill on June 20. The narrow 216 to 211 margin (125 Democrats for, 138 against; 91 Republicans for, 73 against) reflects strong opposition to the bill's most important features.

To stem the flow of illegal aliens, the bill would prohibit employers from knowingly employing illegal aliens. But, unlike the Senate version, which authorizes
criminal penalties for repeat violators, the House bill would provide only civil fines.

The House bill would allow illegal aliens who can show they have been living in the U.S. since January 1982 to apply for temporary resident status within one year after enactment of the bill. They could become permanent residents after two years if they can demonstrate a "minimal understanding of ordinary English" and basic knowledge of U.S. history and government or if they can show that they are studying to achieve such knowledge and understanding. Aliens with minor children must also ensure that the children are enrolled in school. These amnesty provisions are considered much more generous than the Senate version.

**Foes Voice Opposition to Employer Sanctions and Legalization**

Opposition to the House bill focuses on these two key provisions. Hispanic leaders have argued that the employer sanctions could increase job discrimination. They fear that employers, not wanting to risk sanctions, will not hire Hispanics or anyone who looks or sounds foreign. There is also concern that the required learning of English will discourage people from applying for legalization of their status.

House leaders indicated, though, that it was opposition to amnesty that made the vote closer than expected. Rep. Bill McCollum (R-Fla.), author of a defeated amendment that would have dropped the amnesty provision, called the amnesty provision "a magnet that will encourage thousands, possibly millions more, to come across our border," according to the *Washington Post*. Rep. Thomas F. Lewis (R-Fla.) asked, "Is Congress prepared to take a stand against those who deliberately violate our laws?"

This opposition is reinforced by concern that the bill would cause American citizens to lose their jobs to immigrants willing to work for low wages. Concern about jobs caused the AFL-CIO to change its position and oppose the Simpson-Mazzoli bill when the House passed the Panetta amendment, which would allow growers to import foreign guest workers to harvest perishable crops.

**House and Senate Bills Differ on Payments to States and Legal Immigration**

Another important provision of the House bill is the authorization of full federal reimbursement to states for the costs of legalization. The Senate's block grant approach is considered more restrictive.

The House and Senate versions are also significantly different in their approach to legal immigration. The House bill would make no important changes in the current immigration system, but the Senate bill would limit legal immigration to 425,000 people per year, not including refugees.

Other important features make aliens ineligible for most forms of federal financial assistance for five years, starting the day they obtain temporary resident status; allow permanent resident status to Cubans and Haitians who arrived before January 1, 1982, or who have received a "Cuban/Haitian entrant" immigration designation before the enactment of the bill; and make changes in the procedures for excluding aliens and reviewing deportation and asylum cases.

**Future of Immigration Reform Bill Remains Uncertain**

Final enactment of the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration bill is still uncertain; the House and Senate must resolve their differences when they return from their recess on July 23. Speculation has focused on the appointment of conferees to meet in conference and hammer out a compromise that will be acceptable to both houses.

It is possible, though, that the Senate could accept the House version, thus avoiding another House vote on the bill. Strong opposition to various provisions of the bill is expected to be voiced at the Democratic convention July 16-29--Hispanic groups plan demonstrations against the bill there. Because House approval of the bill was so narrow, a few changed votes could spell defeat for the bill that would come out of conference. According to the *New York Times*, House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.) has said that final approval of the bill would not be easy. "It's got a rocky road in front of it," O'Neill said.

Please return your reader survey promptly to Refugee Reports, 815 15th St., NW, Suite 610, Washington, D.C. 20005
SANCTUARY MOVEMENT WORKER TRIED AND SENTENCED IN TEXAS

On June 27, a Catholic lay worker convicted in the Brownsville, Texas, U.S. District Court of transporting illegal aliens was given three consecutive 30-day sentences. The sentences were immediately suspended by the federal judge.

Stacy Lynn Merkt, the first sanctuary movement worker tried for assisting Salvadorans who have entered the U.S. without visas, was also put on probation for two years, according to Bill Davis, S.J., administrative director of the Christic Institute in Washington, D.C. The institute provided defense for Merkt.

The verdict will be appealed to the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans.

Merkt was arrested by the Immigration and Naturalization Service border patrol on February 17 for transporting three Salvadorans across the Rio Grande valley. Arrested with her were another sanctuary movement worker and a reporter for the Dallas Times Herald. In a separate incident, Jack Elder, director of a sanctuary house run by the Brownsville Archdiocese, was arrested in April for transporting three other Salvadorans to a bus depot.

Defense Argued Salvadorans Were Refugees According to the Washington Post, Merkt testified in her trial, "They would have been sent back to El Salvador. They would have been killed." Defense attorney Daniel Sheehan argued that Merkt was innocent because the Salvadorans, who worked in a Lutheran Church-operated refugee camp in El Salvador before they fled, had a well-founded fear of persecution and are bona fide refugees under the Refugee Act of 1980. Merkt said she felt immigration officials, by returning Salvadorans to El Salvador, were violating U.S. asylum laws, the Post reported.

Elder's trial is scheduled for August 6 in Brownsville District Court. The other sanctuary movement worker and the reporter are not expected to be prosecuted.

Continued Growth of Sanctuary Movement Reported Sanctuary supporters have said the case may foreshadow efforts to break the movement. "This is clearly an attempt on the part of the government to chill the movement," Davis said.

However, he reported, the number of churches that have declared themselves sanctuaries has increased from about 100 to about 150 since the arrests in February. The recent decision of some large churches, including Riverside Church in New York, to become sanctuaries in spite of concerns about legality is, Davis said, "a statement that the question of what is illegal will be decided through the appellate process and Congress and not simply by what this administration's officials say is illegal."

Update

* The Senate and House Judiciary Committees have approved the transfer of 2,000 slots to this year's admission ceiling for Southeast Asia. The change, requested by the State Department, reprograms 1,000 from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 750 from the Near East and South Asia, and 250 from Africa. The State Department reported that it has sent a cable to overseas posts, making the changes effective. These numbers will be used especially for unaccompanied minors, Amerasians, and direct departure cases.

* UNHCR reported that 4,555 refugees left Vietnam by boat in May, three times the number in previous months. According to the New York Times of June 20, a spokesman for UNHCR "expressed concern about the increase and said he hoped the exodus had peaked."

* In a June 28 press conference, Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.) denounced the high rate of rejection of asylum applications submitted by Poles and called on INS and the State Department to review asylum procedures and country conditions in Poland. In FY 82, INS denied 92 percent of Polish applications, and 72 percent in the first half of FY 84, he said. "It is inconceivable to me that a fair and equitable asylum process would not result in the elimination of excessive delays and the awarding of political asylum to a substantially higher percentage of Polish refugees," he said.
IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE EXPERIENCE PERFORMED IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

With nine out of ten Californians originating from other regions of the U.S., Mexico, or the Pacific, the immigrant experience is an integral aspect of California culture. So says Michael Bigelow Dixon, resident director of South Coast Repertory (SCR), a nonprofit professional theater serving the Orange County area.

Strong local interest led SCR to produce a play this year that portrays, through their own eyes and words, the experience of immigrants and refugees.

Since its opening ten years ago, part of SCR's overall program has been educational tours serving Orange and Los Angeles counties. This year's focus on immigration and refugees was spawned by results of SCR's telephone survey of area primary and secondary schools. Given that one-quarter of Orange County's population is Latino or non-White, the interest expressed in immigrants was no surprise to theater directors.

Local Immigrants Tell Their Stories

To develop background material for the educational tour, Dixon and colleague Valerie Smith went knocking on the doors of area resettlement agencies and community groups in search of refugees and immigrants who would share their experiences, survival tactics, and reflections. Community workers arranged meetings and helped to defuse the awkwardness of first encounters.

Thirty interviews were conducted, mostly in English, with persons of a variety of nationalities, both voluntary immigrants and those who had fled persecution.

Some refugees were reluctant to speak about their experiences for fear of repercussions against family members who remain in their home country, Smith indicated. However, once they opened up, the interviewees seemed to welcome the opportunity to "express things people didn't seem to take much interest in...very personal and sometimes traumatic events," she said.

With funding by the California Council for the Humanities, Dixon and Smith compiled the interviews, along with articles from scholars, into a book, *Second Lives*. The authors chose to focus on the universal experiences of refugees and immigrants, rather than specific differences or political issues.

"The media focuses on horror stories," said Smith, "but we wanted to create a better understanding of the day-to-day experience here in our community and the tremendous obstacles that [immigrants] confront." Dixon cited a need to move beyond what he calls "the city hall approach" to deal with immigration issues and "delve into a personal level," which is intense on an emotional rather than intellectual level.

Drama as an Educational Tool

With a broader understanding of the experience of refugees and immigrants, repertory directors began production of a play for their 1984 educational tour of area primary and junior high schools. *Finding Home* is the story of a jive-talking California surfer who, while riding the Pacific waves one day, is washed up on the shores of a mythical island.

The aim was to engender respect for different customs and values on a level that young people could relate to, and thus lay a groundwork for them to deal more effectively with tensions that arise in school settings. "We hoped the impact of the play could be felt most among the affluent children who are more often insulated from the immigrant population next door," commented SCR's Community Coordinator Kris Hagen.

Having achieved the original aim of the research on immigrants, the authors felt compelled to present the stories that came out of the "inherently dramatic" interviews. Enabled by a grant from Pacific Bell, another play--*Second Lives*--was produced. With minimal props, the play is performed by four professional actors, who themselves represent a variety of ethnic backgrounds. They present 20 vignettes that touch on separation, isolation, language difficulties, readjustment, strength, and hope.

Response Shows Need

First performed in a local coffeehouse at the end of 1983, *Second Lives* was a great success--more bookings were sought than could be made. Universities, community groups, museums,
and churches showed Second Lives in the months that it ran, ending in May 1984.

Dixon believes drama serves an important function to inform the public-at-large as to "who our neighbors are." He adds, "The reaction [to the play] was always intense. To some viewers, this was totally new information, and for them it was compelling. You identify with the characters, you see that they are real people." Immigrants in the audience, on the other hand, seemed to recognize themselves in the stories and found humor in the situations that indigenous people took more seriously.

Perhaps the most potent response of an audience was silence, Smith says. Students in one ethnically mixed high school squirmed in their seats throughout a performance of Second Lives. But the scene where a Korean teenager talked of his experiences in school evoked a conspicuous silence. Says Smith, "It's hard to gauge, but it seemed like that hit home."

Both Finding Home and Second Lives have been video-recorded and are scheduled to air on PBS television in the coming year.

To order the Second Lives book, send $10 to South Coast Repertory, 655 Town Center Dr., Costa Mesa, CA 92626.

MINNESOTA RESEARCHERS, REFUGEES, AND PROVIDERS COOPERATE TO STUDY SUDDEN DEATH

Sudden Unexpected Nocturnal Death Syndrome (SUNDS) has produced a looming anxiety among Southeast Asian refugees who have resettled in the U.S. The risk for adult Hmong men in the U.S. to die from the syndrome is as great as the four leading causes of death combined for U.S. males of corresponding age.

Despite the risk and although a spokesman for the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta concedes a clear need for monitoring, no nationwide surveillance of suspected cases has been conducted since April 1984. At that time, 80 cases had been reported, nearly all of which occurred since 1977.

In March 1983, CDC completed an epidemiological study of 51 sudden death cases and made note of a further 28 cases. The results were inconclusive. No risk factor could be identified (that is, what kinds of people are likely to be affected by the syndrome), nor could the "triggering factor" be traced.

Need for Broader Research Theories on the cause range from malfunction of the heart's pacemaker to "night terror" dreams that cause heart attacks. Dr. Roy Baron of CDC believes conventional techniques to study diseases are not adequate to understand sudden death syndrome. "There is a definite need to extend the investigation to the clinical level and to the social sciences, to take into consideration the psychosocial and cultural context."

Acknowledging the need for a wider scope of investigation, Ramsey County Medical Center in St. Paul, Minnesota, began the SUNDS Planning Project in April 1984. With a six-month grant from the St. Paul Foundation and other donors, the project established a Technical Task Force. Its small staff will develop a system to collect information about SUNDS and disseminate it to refugees, researchers, and health and social service providers.

Since 1979, the Twin Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis have had 15 of the nation's 80 sudden death victims, all of them Hmong men.

Project Director Neal Holtan, M.D., who has worked for the past five years with Southeast Asian refugees both in Thailand and in the Twin Cities, sees that a critical need at this point is to gather any pertinent data from various disciplines that could contribute to finding the risk factor and cause. One aim is to compile a bibliography of existing research and literature on SUNDS.

Project Collects Information from Many Sources In addition to compiling "hard data," the SUNDS project is collecting opinions and theories about the nature of sudden death—something inadequately addressed in previous research, according to Holtan.

Bilingual Hmong staff conduct interviews with families of victims, refugee community leaders, shamans, and native healers to develop a working base of information. The project's task force has placed great emphasis on the establishment of a more effective liaison with the local Southeast Asian refugee community and leaders.

A major aim of the project is to estab-
lish a preliminary case definition of SUNDS and to establish uniform methods for investigation, reporting, and registration of sudden death cases—a critical starting point for the medical and scientific communities to study any major health problem.

Many Barriers to Investigation  Most studies of the syndrome have focused on physical data. However, examinations of three victims who were resuscitated, as well as the bodies of some who died, have yielded few results. Baron at CDC notes that the triggering factor appears to be something that happens to the individual so rarely that so far it has not been detected.

Compounding the inherent difficulties in studying the syndrome itself, researchers have found great difficulties in working with victims' families.

In one study, when researchers sought to bring the victim's relatives to a St. Paul hospital to monitor their metabolic rates, they met with strong resistance from the subjects. Though the hospital review board considered the tests to be "of low risk" for human subjects, the opposition of the refugees appeared to be based on their beliefs and understandings of what contributed to the death of their loved ones, as well as their expectations of what would result from the study.

This is the kind of cultural and attitudinal gap that led the SUNDS Planning Project Advisory Board, comprised of Hmong leaders and health and social service providers, to work closely with the refugee community.

Project Works Closely with Refugees  Holtan stressed that the way the refugee community is approached on this issue is highly sensitive, and that it has taken tremendous time and effort to develop a functional working relationship with refugees. "Other projects failed because they did not have subjects. The Hmong expected guarantees of answers if they agreed to be subjects of studies. The projects had not taken time to work with the local [refugee] community."

Hmong refugee leaders in Saint Paul Minneapolis have made a commitment to inform the refugee community of the project aims, arrange interviews, and distribute useful information. Other community efforts are being made, such as training 165 Hmong in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation to enable family members to respond to sudden death attacks. Though Red Cross volunteers currently conduct training, plans are underway to train Hmong and other Southeast Asian instructors.

Relevant documents or activities can be brought to the attention of the SUNDS Planning Project at St. Paul Ramsey Medical Center, 640 Jackson St., St. Paul, MN 55101.

SUDAN REFUGEE COMMISSIONER DESCRIBES CURRENT SITUATION IN NORTHEAST AFRICA

As host to over half a million refugees, Sudan has a particular investment in the outcomes of the second International Conference for Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II), according to Sudan Commissioner for Refugees Abdel Magid El Ahmadi. El Ahmadi paid a visit to Washington, D.C., in mid-June and spoke with Refugee Reports about some of Sudan's difficulties in harboring the refugees and its hopes for ICARA II.

United Nations member states gather with private donors mid-July in Geneva to seek international support for assistance to refugees. The UNHCR-initiated conference is seen as a significant breakthrough in forging links between international development assistance and refugee aid. Participants seek international support for assistance to refugees in three categories: care for refugees; promoting voluntary repatriation and local integration; and developing infrastructure in receiving countries.

Refugees Continue to Enter Sudan  There are 5,000 refugees from Zaire and 200,000 from Uganda in southern Sudan, though the flow from these two countries has decreased considerably. Last year 22,000 refugees repatriated from Sudan to Chad, though another thousand re-entered this year.

Refugees from Ethiopia now number 485,000, and the commissioner reported that the influx has sharply increased this year, coming largely from Tigre province in northern Ethiopia. He claimed that 200-300 refugees enter Sudan daily.

An April 1984 report by the U.S. embassy in Sudan attributes the heightened exodus
to extreme famine conditions and the introduction last fall of mandatory military conscription for adults in Ethiopia.

**Limited Capacity to Absorb Refugees** Newly arrived refugees register with the UNHCR at transit centers in border areas of Sudan. There, they are entitled to receive immediate relief supplies, including World Food Program rations. Refugees may reside in the transit camps for up to two years. Transit centers currently accommodate far more refugees than intended, according to El Ahmadi. For example, Tawawa (near Gedaref), which currently accommodates 20,000 refugees, was built for 5,000 people.

Refugees constitute one-fourth of the 2 million inhabitants in the heavily impacted Eastern region of Sudan. The strain on Sudan is beginning to show, El Ahmadi indicated. "We have a limited capacity to absorb refugees," he said. "We welcomed refugees for many years, but now it is becoming a problem for our own people."

The critical water shortage throughout Sudan has caused a 50 percent cut in agricultural production in the rich Eastern region, which produces Sudan's staple sorghum. El Ahmadi noted that now Sudan cannot produce enough to feed its own people.

Sudan, as well as neighboring Ethiopia, is affected by increased desertification around the Sahel strip across the north of Africa. Deforestation in areas inhabited by refugees poses another serious problem, as they search for fuel and materials to build shelters.

As resources become more scarce, many refugees gravitate to cities in search of work. Gedaref, Kassala and Port Sudan each have refugee populations of over 50,000. The commissioner stated that the impact is most severe on health and education services. Whereas UNHCR provides health care in clinics, the Sudan government pays for hospitalization. He cited the example of Gedaref, where, on occasion, 50 percent of the hospital patients has been refugees.

The burden of refugee students is also felt sharply in intermediate and secondary schools, according to El Ahmadi. "Our own students must compete [with refugees] for chairs in schoolrooms," he said.

**Self-Sufficiency Projects Need International Aid** Sudan, in its 20-year history of hosting refugees, has already paved the way for a developmental approach to caring for refugees with their strategy of agricultural settlements.

Over a hundred thousand refugees in Sudan have been relocated to agricultural settlements in an attempt to assist them to become self-sufficient. With international funding, Sudan's Commission for Refugees (COR) oversees the projects. Refugees supply most of the labor to construct the settlements, including development of water supply, sanitation, and agricultural schemes.

Currently the viability of the agricultural projects is threatened by lack of rainfall, and El Ahmadi is seriously concerned about how refugees will be supported. "We want to continue to accept genuine refugees, but we must in some way lessen the burden on our own people."

**Returnees Fewer Than Ethiopia Claims** Asked whether refugees are returning to Ethiopia, the commissioner said that government statistics show that only one thousand refugees have repatriated to Ethiopia. The UN donated U.S. $20 million to Ethiopia in 1982 for a program to assist returnees from Sudan and Somalia. The UNHCR 1983 Annual Report states that 417 refugees returned to Ethiopia from Sudan. El Ahmadi asserted that more important than the number of returnees is the fact that hundreds continue to arrive daily into Sudan in search of asylum.

Though El Ahmadi said he favors repatriation of refugees, it must follow an "amicable and true" resolution of the underlying causes of their flight. He stressed the need for the international community to give serious attention to the underlying causes of refugee flight in the Northeast African region in working out equitable solutions.

**Funds for New Projects Sought** In consultation with UNHCR, UNDP and OAU, Sudan has proposed 30 projects to address long-term needs presented by the refugee situation in Sudan. The projects include a fishing cooperative along the Red Sea, several water development projects, teacher training, reforestation, and an anti-malaria campaign.
in a refugee quarter around the capital, Khartoum. The projects, worth U.S. $92 million, would benefit both refugees and Sudanese.

El Ahmadi stressed that Sudan appreciates the multi-lateral and bilateral aid Sudan has received to support refugees. He noted that the U.S. has been their "biggest helper." U.S.-funded projects include a $3 million water project in Port Sudan and another in Gedaref, a $4.5 million reforestation project in the Eastern region, and assistance to Ugandan refugees in the South.

Meetings and Conferences

SAN DIEGO CONFERENCE ON RESETTLEMENT STRATEGIES

The San Diego Refugee Coalition hosted a conference, "Refugees in the USA, Successful Resettlement Strategies—Present and Future," June 7 to 9 at the San Diego University campus.

Over 20 workshops were held throughout the three-day meeting, addressing a wide range of topics. Some focused on practical matters of implementing federal programs (such as targeted assistance and job training), while others focused on creative local initiatives, (cross-cultural consciousness-raising for ESL teachers or employment-related aspects of communicable disease). Some of the workshops were intended to foster a broader understanding among those working with refugees, for example, Indochinese naming systems.

The workshops were interspersed with films and presentations by national experts on domestic policies and featured a special panel on the Orderly Departure Program in Vietnamese language. On a lighter note, traditional craft work was presented by a local craft cooperative, and songs and dances were performed.

The meeting was attended by people involved in resettlement in various capacities—state offices, service providers, resettlement agencies, representatives of federal programs, and the UNHCR. San Diego International Rescue Committee Director Cindy Jensen said, "One of the benefits that conferences like this give is to have some of our Washington experts come out and view some of California's present and future strategies for making our programs better, viewing our successes and sharing our failures, and giving us assistance in a partnership effort to correct these failures."

A plenary session presented conclusions from health, education, employment, and resettlement tracks of the conference. The need to mainstream services for refugees was raised, as was the need to coordinate public and private sector efforts. Jensen concluded, "Working within our agencies, we tend to dwell on our problems and not vividly voice the successes and the self-sufficiency that has been attained and continues to be attained."

[This article is based on written material contributed by Ron Curtain, Cindy Jensen, and other conference organizers.]

Reader Exchange

NEW REGULATIONS ABOUT REFUGEE TRAVEL DOCUMENTS

Refugee travel documents, the forms issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service which refugees use in lieu of passports, will now be issued for two years, not one, according to the Federal Register of May 4 (page 18996). The principal reason for this change is to streamline the process of obtaining travel documents and to make the refugee travel document compatible with the alien entry permit, which is now also valid two years.

Beginning a year from now, this new procedure will save a yearly trip to the INS office; securing a new travel document usually involves a considerable wait, particularly if the refugee has to use one of the more crowded INS offices, such as those in Los Angeles, Houston, or New York.

In the meantime, however, the decision represents a mixed blessing. Refugees carrying documents which are more than one year old will have no trouble being admitted at U.S. ports of entry. But they may have difficulties entering other nations, as the documents they carry will have expired dates together with notations that the documents cannot be renewed.
The refugee travel documents can only be issued in the U.S. at INS offices; about 8,200 are issued each year.

Obtain New Document or Endorsement

The New TransCentury Foundation, which has several refugees doing economic development work overseas, has worked out the following advice for its employees, according to David North, a TransCentury vice president:

"Refugees now in the U.S. who plan trips overseas which will last beyond the expiration date of their travel documents should simply apply for new travel documents before they leave. INS will not renew their current ones, but they will issue brand new ones, which will be good for two years," he said.

As a fall-back position, North suggested that a refugee in the U.S. seek an endorsement from an INS office indicating that the document would be good for an additional year. While the endorsement would not look quite as impressive as a new document, it would be easier to acquire and presumably would cost nothing; a new refugee travel document carries a $15 fee.

Refugees who are outside the country need not return to the U.S. at the end of the year to get new travel documents, but they should seek an endorsement on their current document from a consular officer overseas. That endorsement (which INS permits but does not mandate) could read: "All refugee travel documents, since May 4, 1984, are routinely valid for two years from their issuance date; see 8CFR 223a." The endorsement should be signed by the consular officer and stamped with an official seal, North continued.

"The endorsement is for the benefit of refugees seeking admission to other nations and is not necessary if the refugee simply wishes to return to the U.S.," he stressed.

Resources

REPORT ON DISPLACED PERSONS IN EL SALVADOR

The Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights and Americas Watch have issued a joint report on the situation of displaced persons in El Salvador. The report, El Salvador's Other Victims: The War on the Displaced, is based on a January 1984 visit to El Salvador by a delegation representing the two organizations.

The study details the conditions of the estimated 468,000 Salvadorans displaced within the country, most of them women, children, and the elderly. Inadequate nutrition and health care, military attacks on displaced persons and relief workers, the role of U.S. policy in the continued victimization of the displaced, waste and corruption in the use of U.S. aid funds, and alleged forced relocation of the displaced to areas still in conflict are examined in the report. Recommendations include the need to recognize the long-term nature of the displaced persons problem and to provide adequate care and protection. A key recommendation is that U.S. aid should be provided only through neutral private organizations.

The U.S. State Department has characterized the report as a series of negative generalizations based on isolated observations.

Copies of the 257-page report are available for $10.00 each from The Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights, 36 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036.

REGION X RESOURCE BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Bibliography of Refugee Resources, Region X, ORR (Washington, Oregon, and Idaho), is available from the Center for Urban Education in Portland. Published in March 1984, it is intended to serve as a resource in locating written and audio-visual materials, and as a tool in networking among service providers. Materials are categorized by subject, including communication, cultural orientation, employment, ESL, physical and mental health, refugee orientation, research, sponsor orientation, volunteer programs and training.

The 270 entries include standard bibliographic information, what language(s) the material is available in, target audience, and educational/language/resettlement level of the client for whom the material was developed. To order, send $1.75 for postage and handling to the Center for Urban Education, 0245 S.W. Bancroft, Portland, OR 97201, or call (503) 221-0984.
### FY 84 Refugee Arrivals as of April 30, 1984 (All Nationalities) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>YTD FY 84</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>YTD FY 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist of Columbia</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>Johnson Atoll</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>No. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>Midway Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Trust Territories</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Wake Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,6637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information in this report is based on documents from ACVA, ICM and other federal agencies available on the date of this report and may not include information on all refugees in the categories reported.

### Southeast Asian Refugees: Estimated Cumulative State Populations a/ Including Entries from 1975 through 4/30/84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>252,100</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist of Columbia</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>23,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>55,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>31,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Other Territories</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>686,100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adjusted for secondary migration through 9/30/83, rounded to the nearest hundred.

** Fewer than 100.

Note: New adjustments for secondary migration were incorporated into these estimates as of 9/30/83.

Source: Office of Refugee Resettlement, Department of Health and Human Services
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**READER SURVEY**

To help us evaluate the usefulness of the newsletter and to know how we can best meet your informational needs, we ask for your cooperation to assess *Refugee Reports*. Please take a few minutes to answer this questionnaire and return it to us promptly.

**HOW USEFUL OR RELEVANT TO YOUR WORK ARE THE TYPES OF COVERAGE IN Refugee Reports?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Coverage</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News on U.S legislation/regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of agencies, programs or activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of specific issues (e.g., health, employment, women's issues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News about international events/programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on conferences/meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources (curricular materials, audio visuals, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT OTHER TYPES OF ARTICLES WOULD BE OF INTEREST TO YOU?**

**WHAT OTHER INFORMATION SOURCES DO YOU REGULARLY RELY ON IN YOUR WORK?**

**HOW DO YOU RATE THESE ASPECTS OF REFUGEE REPORTS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Style/Readability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance/Organization of Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

**DO YOU SHARE Refugee Reports WITH COLLEAGUES?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share with Colleagues</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>How Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAST YEAR, WE BEGAN TO SEND *Refugee Reports* BY 3RD CLASS MAIL TO KEEP COSTS DOWN. HOW DOES THAT AFFECT ITS USEFULNESS IN YOUR WORK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IN THE PAST FEW MONTHS, WE HAVE TRIED SOME NEW APPROACHES IN FORMAT AND SCHEDULE OF *Refugee Reports*. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THESE CHANGES?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like Very Much</th>
<th>Like Somewhat</th>
<th>Don't Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longer publication issued monthly</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longer articles</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with a single-topic focus</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg., USCR study on public attitudes)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles by writers &quot;from the field&quot;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE NOTE ANY SUGGESTIONS YOU HAVE FOR COVERAGE, STYLE, OR TOPICS. (Additional comments may be attached.)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. PLEASE MAIL THE SURVEY TO OUR ADDRESS BELOW.
BRP TO BE MORE INVOLVED IN COLLECTION OF REFUGEE TRAVEL LOANS

Repayments of refugee travel loans have increased substantially during the last two years, but the overall level of repayment remains low. As a result of continued concern about the lack of loan payments, the Bureau for Refugee Programs (BRP) has approved four actions designed to help the voluntary agencies collect the travel loans.

In an interview with Refugee Reports, Norman Runkles, BRP comptroller, said that $34 million in loan payments from all refugees had been collected from the time the program began in the early 1960s through 1983. Over half of that amount was repaid in the last two years, including a little less than $10 million in 1983. But, Runkles said, just under $200 million in loans have been issued. The largest share, about $150 million, involves refugees from Southeast Asia.

The Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM) arranges transportation to the U.S. for refugees, who sign a promissory note agreeing to repay the loan to the voluntary agencies responsible for their resettlement. The U.S. government subsidizes ICM for the full cost of refugee transportation. Funds repaid to the voluntary agencies, less 25 percent kept to cover collection costs, are returned to ICM to pay for transporting refugees admitted to the U.S. in the future.

Efforts to Collect Loans Increased  Sources at the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC), Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS), the State Department, and ICM agreed that before 1980, there was little concern about payment of loans. Then a government push on repaying all kinds of government loans--student loans perhaps the most publicized--led to an agreement among the volags, BRP, and ICM to emphasize loan collection.

The new commitment to loan collection and the computerization initiated by several of the voluntary agencies have contributed to significant increases in the rate of repayment since 1982. According to Tusja Prelin of LIRS, the varied attitudes of vologs toward collection had created a situation where one refugee would be reluctant to make loan payments knowing that
another refugee was not being billed. A more consistent pro-collection policy among the volags since 1982 has reduced that problem, Trelin said.

Computers have allowed USCC and LIRS to begin billing their outstanding accounts regularly. After entering its 17,000 active accounts into the computer, LIRS sent its first computerized statements at the end of April. Loan collections for May were $132,000, compared to previous normal monthly collections of $40,000-60,000, Trelin said.

USCC finished putting 150,000 accounts, about 40 percent of all refugee loan accounts, into their computer by December 1983, according to Barbara Phillips of USCC. Within three months, there was a 75 percent improvement in repayments, she said. Now the repayment rate is between 300 and 400 percent over the 1980 rate. However, Phillips said, this improvement, while substantial, is from a time when there was hardly any collection being done.

The loans are designed to cover approximately 80 percent of the actual transportation costs. The amount of a promissory note is determined only by the refugee's point of departure, regardless of his or her destination in the U.S., according to Richard Scott of ICM. He said the current loan for an adult departing from Southeast Asia is $480. For Western Europe, the amount is $270, from Southern Africa, $800. The rates for refugees who came to the U.S. before 1982 were less. The loan for an infant under two years old is ten percent of the full amount; for a child under 12, it is 50 percent.

BRP Approves Actions In late July, Runkles reported, BRP approved four steps to bring about improved collections. Each step addresses a specific problem that the government, the volags, and ICM have identified.

A letter will be sent from the State Department this month, signed by Runkles, to a selected list of refugees who have made no payments. The letter will emphasize the refugees' obligation, the fact that the funds were provided by the U.S. government, and the use of collected loans in helping future refugees. USCC will mail the same letter, along with a letter from John McCarthy, USCC Migration and Refugee Services director, to 40,000 of its active accounts. Runkles called the two mailings a pilot project to test the belief, which he shares, that most refugees will respond favorably once they understand the source and nature of the loan.

Brochure to Be Developed BRP also plans to develop an informational brochure explaining the loan program, the U.S. role in its funding, and the importance of repayment, emphasizing that it is one of the refugees' new responsibilities in the U.S. The brochure will be for use in ESL or cultural orientation classes in camps and refugee processing centers overseas and will be distributed to refugees when they sign their promissory notes. It will also be available to volags to send out with their first notices after refugees' arrival in the U.S. Runkles expressed the hope that the brochure would be available within a few months.

Like the letter, the brochure is designed to overcome the perception, left over from earlier times, that it was not necessary to repay. This notion may have been encouraged by the knowledge that the large numbers of Southeast Asian refugees first brought to the U.S. by U.S. military air transport did not have to pay for their travel, according to Trelin. Phillips agreed, stating, "There is a need to get the message across to everyone that for those who are able to pay, it's an obligation."

Questions Raised about Loan Language The third step planned by BRP is a review of the actual language of the promissory note refugees sign. Runkles said there is some feeling that the note is unclear and that its language needs to be more clearly binding and enforceable.

Runkles said this problem reflects an earlier lack of consensus about the loans and whether they were meant to be repaid. However, he added, the refugee travel loan program was definitely represented to Congress as a loan, not a grant, when it was established in the early 1960s.

Even among those who agreed that refugees had an obligation to repay the loans, there has always been some disagreement over whether the notes constituted a legal or moral obligation.

George Salvatierra, an evaluator at the
Government Accounting Office (GAO), confirmed that GAO is conducting a study of the ICM loan program. The report will address mechanical problems in the collection system and questions of the enforceability of the notes. He suggested that improvements in the collection process might increase collections only to a point that would still be unacceptably low. To achieve higher repayment levels, changes in the enforcement of the notes would probably be necessary.

Runkles agreed that it is important for the notes to be clearly enforceable, as was always intended, but added, "I would rather argue that the loan was provided in good faith with the understanding it would be repaid and the refugees have a responsibility to repay it."

Finally, BRP agreed to pursue, with other government agencies, ways to obtain current addresses of refugees in order to help the voluntary agencies update their mailing lists. Trelin said the biggest problem LIRS has is reaching refugees who have moved. Of 17,000 accounts, she stated that at least 3,000 were inactive because the agency had lost track of their current addresses.

Phillips estimated that 33,000 of USCC's accounts were lost and said it was typical for about one-fifth to be lost due to refugees' moving. She suggested that orientation in the camps needs to stress the importance of refugees keeping the voluntary agencies informed of their addresses.

**Higher Repayment Levels Expected**

Runkles was optimistic that the measures already taken and those planned will produce results by the end of this year. He is also looking into other measures that would provide further incentives to repay loans if such action seems necessary to increase payments.

While only 17 percent of all loans have been repaid so far, sources agreed that 50-60 percent is an attainable goal. Runkles said that, for new refugees, given a clear and early understanding of the loans, agencies should be able to collect 80-90 percent over the three years the notes allow for repayment.

Runkles stressed the importance of the effort to improve refugee travel loan collections. "It is hard to go to the Hill to ask for refugee program appropriations when Congress looks and says, 'You have all this debt outstanding.' They see that we haven't just been unsuccessful. We have not been trying actively," he said. "The fault lies with the Bureau, not with ICM, the voluntary agencies, or the refugees," Runkles added. "Why pay if no one is asking?"

Trelin said that LIRS feels strongly that the loans should be repaid. "Travel loan repayment is fair; it's good PR for the resettlement program to say refugees pay for their own trip and aren't getting everything free," Trelin said. She also reported that repaying loans has been useful in helping refugees establish credit ratings. Congregational sponsors have worked with refugees to set up payment schedules and have used the process to teach budgeting. Trelin concluded, "It's wonderful to receive letters from refugees when they've paid in full and they're full of pride and good feeling that they're helping someone else to come."

### Recent Developments

**SUPREME COURT LEAVES IMPORTANT QUESTIONS UNANSWERED: THE STEVIC DECISION**

In a June 5 decision, the Supreme Court declined to define the standard an alien must meet to win political asylum. Acknowledging that the phrase "well-founded fear of persecution" was made applicable to asylum requests by the Refugee Act of 1980, the court refused to define the phrase, stating in a unanimous opinion delivered by Justice Stevens, "That issue is not presented by this case."

The court's decision in INS v. Stevic dealt only with the standard of proof in cases where aliens apply for withholding of deportation under Section 243(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980. Earlier expectations of an important decision affecting the determination of asylum status under Section 208 were disappointed. Observers were surprised by the court's separation of the issues, since all parties in the case had assumed that the standards of proof for having deportation withheld and for gaining...
Supreme Court Rules Congress Meant No Loosening of Standards. The court overturned a U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals ruling that the Refugee Act of 1980, by accepting the refugee definition in the UN protocol relating to the status of refugees, had made the standard of proof required for having deportation withheld more generous. The Second Circuit had held that Stevic could avoid deportation by demonstrating a "well-founded fear of persecution" and did not need to show that he faced a "clear probability of persecution" if returned to his native Yugoslavia.

The government contended that Congress, in passing the Refugee Act, had not intended to alter the type and amount of evidence required for withholding of deportation. Stevic's lawyers and several briefs filed in support of Stevic by public interest law groups and human rights organizations argued that Congress had intended to modify U.S. law to make it conform with the UN protocol and, in particular, the provision outlawing refoulement--involuntary return--of refugees.

Section 243(h) says deportation to a country must be withheld for any alien if that "alien's life or freedom would be threatened" in that country. The court ruled that this language was consistent with the standard in use before the Refugee Act; this standard, as applied, required an applicant for withholding of deportation to show a "clear probability of persecution."

Persecution Must Be "More Likely Than Not". The court ruled that Section 243(h) implied that a likelihood of persecution is required since deportation must be withheld if an alien's life or freedom "would" be threatened, not if it "might" or "could" be. Thus, the court said, "The question under that standard is whether it is more likely than not that the alien would be subject to persecution." An alien applying for withholding of deportation must provide some objective evidence to show this likelihood. The court pointed out that Stevic was seeking withholding under Section 243(h), not under the asylum provisions of Section 208.

Although the court avoided defining the phrase "well-founded fear of persecution," which is now in the U.S. provisions for providing asylum and refugee status, it did enter into some discussion of the issue. INS had argued that the "clear probability" standard and the "well-founded fear" standard were virtually the same, that persecution must be more likely than not for a fear to be "well-founded."

The court agreed that the two phrases had been used interchangeably in practice. It discounted the position that a "fear of persecution is 'well-founded' if the evidence establishes some objective basis in reality for the fear." Justice Stevens' opinion stated, "A more moderate position is that so long as an objective situation is established by the evidence, it need not be shown that the situation will probably result in persecution, but it is enough that persecution is a reasonable possibility."

Implications Not Clear. This suggestion that "well-founded fear" may be interpreted more generously than "clear probability," combined with the court's apparent sympathy for the INS position that the Refugee Act was not intended to change existing standards, has generated some confusion and speculation on the decision's implications. According to Patricia Weiss Fagan of the Refugee Policy Group, many of the people who wrote in support of Stevic's case believe that the Supreme Court decision, while unanimous and cast in language supportive of the INS arguments, leaves the door open for further litigation. However, Fagan added, "Others believe that the decision will encourage INS to be even stricter than it is now in its application of the 'clear probability' standard of evidence."

UNION CLAIMS DUE PROCESS DENIED TO SALVADORANS IN SUIT AGAINST U.S.

A 1982 suit charging that the U.S. denies due process to Salvadorans who seek temporary haven here came to a critical juncture mid-July as lawyers for both sides sought a settlement based on existing submissions to the court. The suit was filed by the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union Local 25 against the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), U.S. State Department, and the Attorney General in the D.C. District of Columbia.
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Court. Judge Ritchie is currently deliberating whether the case merits a trial.

Union Appeals on Behalf of Salvadoran Members The 10,000-member Local 25 charges that federal government policy toward Salvadorans impedes the ability of the trade union to organize and operate effectively. They claim that Salvadoran members cannot report unfair or illegal labor practices for fear of being deported to El Salvador. The union estimates that it has 1,000 Salvadoran members.

Local 25 business agent John Boardman says that many Salvadorans have come to him with "horror stories" and asked him to help start unions in their workplaces. For example, in one case, two Salvadorans complained to him that they worked for minimum wage. They split one wage, that is, for two persons' work. Yet they would not report this violation for fear of being deported.

High Rate of Asylum Denials Since 1979, an estimated one million—fully one-fifth of El Salvador's population—have become refugees either inside or outside El Salvador, according to the Central American Refugee Center in Washington, D.C.

INS estimates that half a million Salvadorans are in the U.S. Since 1979, 24,000 Salvadorans have applied for asylum. Only 311 applications have been granted so far in FY 84, while 10,076 have been denied.

Compared to other nationalities, Salvadorans have one of the lowest rates of asylum approvals. By comparison, 78 percent of Soviet, 29 percent of Polish, and 44 percent of Romanian asylum seekers had been granted asylum in FY 84 as of June 1984.

Represented by Robert Ades and Associates law firm, Local 25 alleged that the U.S. government denies due process to Salvadorans in two ways. First, INS gives too much weight to State Department advisory opinions, the suit charges, in determining Salvadoran asylum cases. The overwhelming majority of Salvadoran cases are denied.

Secondly, due process is denied in that Salvadorans are not eligible for Extended Voluntary Departure (EVD), a special status which may be granted to nationals from strife-torn nations, temporarily allowing them to remain in the U.S. until the situation in their country stabilizes. EVD is currently granted to nationals from Poland, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan.

Judge Unexpectedly Decided to Hear Case Shortly after the union filed the suit, the government parties called for the case to be dismissed, arguing that this is a foreign affairs matter not appropriate for court review and that the union had no right to advocate for illegal workers.

In a move that surprised observers, Judge Ritchie denied the government's request in April 1983 and chose to hear the case. He stated that the union was acting appropriately to appeal on the behalf of alien workers because they fall under the definition of employees regardless of their immigration status.

Both parties presented their cases to the court, submitting written documents in response to inquiries. In oral arguments, the union's attorneys probed the methods State Department uses in forming their advisory opinions. Union attorneys concluded that the informational basis for the advisory opinion judgments is highly limited. The opinions are granted arbitrarily and "with no knowledge of the situation in El Salvador outside of what they read on the front pages of the newspaper," according to Allan Ebert-Miner of Robert Ades and Associates. An INS spokesman said that the U.S. Embassy in El Salvador is the primary source for information in preparing advisory opinions.

Both parties have now made motions to settle the case without a trial. The union, on the one hand, appealed for the court to compel the attorney general to grant EVD for Salvadorans, to thoroughly review the asylum process, and to institute appropriate reforms. The government, on the other hand, appealed for the court to dismiss the case, claiming that it does not constitute a case of controversy.

Broad Implications If Judge Ritchie decides to bring the case to trial, reverberations will be felt across the country, according to Union attorney Richard Bromberg.

INS spokesman Duke Austin stated that Salvadorans are not routinely denied asylum. In fact, he said, Salvadorans received the fourth highest number of asylum acceptances of all nationalities. Austin claimed that the reason most Salvadorans are denied...
asylum is that they often cannot produce documentation that shows they would be persecuted. He compared their situation to that of the Baha'i in Iran. "You have a situation where (Baha'i) people are slaughtered in mass. I don't know that any particular group in El Salvador is treated that way."

Austin said that most Salvadorans come to the U.S. for economic gain and that the U.S. does not grant asylum for that reason. Union representative Boardman disagrees. He commented, "Given the opportunity to work in their own country in peace, the people wouldn't be here."

NATIONS DISCUSS PROGRAMS TO ASSIST AFRICAN REFUGEES

Representatives of 11 nations converged in Geneva July 9-11 for the second International Conference on Assistance for Refugees in Africa (ICARA II). The conference was convened by the UN Secretary General to spearhead a new approach to deal with the impact of 4 million refugees on already impoverished countries. Prior to the conference, 14 African states hosting significant numbers of refugees or returnees proposed projects worth $362 million. The Organization for African Unity (OAU) and U.N. Development Programme (UNDP) sent technical experts for on-site visits and approved 128 projects for presentation to the conference.

Unprecedented Cooperation The first ICARA, held in April 1981, raised $570 million for emergency relief aid for Africa's refugees. ICARA II, however, set in motion a new international policy for handling refugee assistance. Though UNHCR's mandate is primarily to protect refugees, it also seeks to encourage "durable solutions" to refugee situations. The ICARA II conference has initiated a joint effort by UNHCR and UNDP to develop infrastructure in poor countries that shelter asylees. One aim of the conference was to get the international community's approval for UNHCR's new way to assist refugees and countries that host them, according to a UNHCR spokesman in Washington, D.C. Though there was much agreement in the speeches presented to the conference about the new policy direction toward durable solutions, there was reportedly no actual opportunity for substantive discussion of the projects themselves or feedback about them.

Concurrent with conference proceedings, negotiations on the nuts and bolts of funding and implementing projects took place in private consultations between donor and recipient governments.

Projects proposed to ICARA II would build transport and water facilities, develop agriculture, forestry, and fisheries, and improve education, health, and social services. Sudan proposed the most projects, worth $92 million, followed (in order of dollar value of proposed projects) by Somalia, Ethiopia, Zaire, Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Burundi, Rwanda, Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Kenya.

Refugee and Development Aid Combined The U.S. commends the new approaches as a more effective way for donors to aid refugees. The U.S. State Department is now shifting to combine refugee relief and developmental assistance through established bilateral aid channels. In FY 84 the U.S. Congress approved $45 million for income-generating and agricultural projects in Sudan, Chad, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi and Swaziland. So far $15 million has been appropriated for FY 85 for special African resettlement services and facilities (ARSF), according to House Africa subcommittee aide Ann Holloway. Representative Ted Weiss (D-NY) is expected to submit a bill for further appropriations for 1985.

Though the emphasis on development has been highly commended by the international community, policy makers and program implementors have raised many questions and issues about practical implementation.

The capacity of international organizations to undertake the new roles mandated is one issue raised. Some observers are concerned that UNDP's workload is now being expanded, but not its resources. As one volag official put it, the U.S. "keeps UNDP on a short leash." A State Department spokesman called for other nations, particularly Gulf states, to support UNDP. There is also concern as to whether UNHCR can continue to respond to emergency situations when they are already stretched to capacity.

U.S. voluntary agencies have expressed dismay at the way governments negotiate
programs and then turn to volags to implement them. They have called for greater participation by volags to assess needs and design suitable programs, rather than being given a "shopping list" of projects to implement.

Political Aspects Avoided The causes of refugee problems were not addressed at ICARA II because of the potentially explosive situation that it would entail. Though the conference "could easily have drifted into the political arena," the focus was humanitarian, according to one participant. A State Department official in the U.S. delegation to ICARA II said that though internal conflicts and border disputes are at the root of the refugee crisis in Africa, the finger-pointing needs to be left to African nations themselves. However, projects undertaken in an information vacuum can cause unforeseen complications. Holloway stressed the need to scrutinize the actual impacts of the international community's humanitarian efforts to avoid exacerbating existing local tensions.

Many ICARA II participants agreed upon a need for recipients and donors to account for expenditures and accomplishments of the African projects, and called for the development of mechanisms to follow up the progress of programs approved at ICARA II.

Projects and Programs

USCC Demonstration Project Results Spur Efforts to Expand

The success of a U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) demonstration project in Chicago has prompted the other voluntary agencies there to join in a proposal to extend the project. The goal of the Chicago project was to employ refugees within six months of arrival in the U.S. without recourse to public assistance.

USCC officials believe the project shows that resettlement costs nationwide can be reduced without lowering refugee admissions. They recently offered their cooperation to California officials now planning a demonstration project to use Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), rather than APDC, as the primary assistance program.

Initiated in March 1983 with the encouragement of U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs Eugene Douglas, the Chicago project tested USCC's contention that voluntary agencies can provide a more appropriate environment for meeting a refugee's needs than the public welfare system, said Mark Franken, USCC coordinator for refugee programs. USCC contends that refugees' needs are transitional and, in the right environment, most employable refugees can be viably employed within six months.

According to a report prepared by the Refugee Policy Group (RPG), 74 percent of the 246 employable refugees in the project were employed within six months of arrival, without extensive ESL or any vocational training in the U.S. Only 8 percent of those in the Chicago labor market were unemployed.

The report, The Chicago Project: An Alternative Resettlement Approach, states that 421 clients, representing 188 cases, were resettled by Catholic Charities--Archdiocese of Chicago (CCAC) during the study period, March to September 1983. Of those, 58 percent, or 246, were employable.

Project Features Contribute to Success

One of the most important features of the project was a unified philosophy toward resettlement, Franken said. This approach, which stresses a commitment to early employment and taking advantage of educational and training opportunities outside working hours, enabled everyone providing services to a refugee to cooperate and give the refugee a consistent message.

The case management component was another essential feature of the project, Franken said. It provided for a resettlement plan for each refugee and close monitoring of all services provided. It also maintained regular contact between the refugee and the case manager. Franken continued, "The close relationship between the case manager and the job developer, located in the same office, enabled them to find specific jobs for specific individuals."

The ability to provide cash assistance directly to employable refugees, without introducing them to the public assistance system, "helped direct each refugee toward appropriate objectives," according to Franken. Providing financial assistance in response to actual needs, based on continu-
ing evaluations of sponsor support, income from jobs, and other resources, discouraged the refugee from acquiring the notion that assistance is an entitlement.

Franken stressed that this system applied only to employable refugees. Those determined to be unemployable were referred to the public assistance offices. Only 14 cases, involving 16 individuals, were determined to be unemployable and categorically eligible for public assistance, according to the RPG report.

The project report suggests direct cash assistance ensured regular contact between the case manager and the client. It also permitted sanctioning of refugees who failed to comply with their resettlement plans. Income supplements were provided to refugees who found employment that paid less than they would receive under established cash assistance needs. This eliminated a major disincentive to taking low-paying jobs.

Use of Public Assistance Low The public assistance utilization rate for those not determined to be unemployable and eligible for public assistance was less than 2 percent at the end of the project period. The RPG report states that of the 421 persons resettled, seven clients were receiving public assistance on March 31, compared to 40 percent of other refugees resettled in Chicago during the project period.

The project's cash assistance costs for six months of assistance to arriving refugees was $146,302. Based on several assumptions about the pattern of public assistance utilization in Chicago, the report states that the comparable costs to the state for public assistance for six months would have been $264,808.

The relationship between high assistance costs and perceived need to lower refugee admissions was a major incentive for the USCC effort. Franken said, "USCC can't accept closing the doors to refugees because too many refugees are on public assistance when there are ways of solving the problem."

Contributing Factors Not All Replicable Some of the factors contributing to the project's success could not necessarily be planned into a resettlement system, according to the RPG report. For example, the project's client population was not typical of the national refugee population. Southeast Asian refugees represented only 21.5 percent of the project's population, a much lower portion than the national average. Over 50 percent of the clients were from Eastern European countries.

The interest of state, federal, and national voluntary agency officials increased the staff's commitment, the report states; everyone involved in the Chicago project made extra efforts to make the project succeed. "Whether a resettlement system could maintain, under non-demonstration circumstances, the level of activity that characterized CCAC operations during the past year remains to be seen."

The report also states that coordination "must be the basis for any effective case management approach." The USCC project depended on extensive cooperation from other refugee service providers, including the Illinois Department of Public Aid.

Volags Propose Project Extension George Wadsworth, director of the Chicago affiliate of World Relief, expressed doubts about the generalizability of some aspects of the USCC project, but said, "There's no denying the results."

On June 12, the six Chicago voluntary agencies involved in refugee resettlement submitted a proposal to the State Department, ORR, and the six national voluntary agencies for a project similar to one recently completed by USCC, Wadsworth said. Most of the national agencies sent letters in support of the proposal to the State Department at the end of July.

Wadsworth suggested that the real potential of the project is its emphasis on newly arriving refugees. "Many current refugee services are coping with problems that are a residue of prior years of resettlement," he said. "We need a program that emphasizes newly arriving refugees to keep them from becoming past-service liabilities, so we don't just defer services to later years."

Wadsworth said the proposal maintains the basic resettlement philosophy and methods of each agency while still addressing the core principles of the project. Because it proposes a unified model, providing for 12 months of case management, the distinction between ORR and State Department responsibilities is a major issue.
Ultimately, Franken said, USCC would like the State Department to increase the length of time and the resources available for reception and placement. By providing the voluntary agencies with adequate resources to provide six months of assistance and case management, Franken believes that most refugees would be employed within six months and would never use general public assistance.

Implications for California Project An agreement between ORR and California officials for a project that would use Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) instead of AFDC as the main public assistance program offers an opportunity to implement the principles of the Chicago project in a state where the results could be critical to the national program, Franken said.

The purpose of the change is to improve the employment incentives for refugees, according to Dick Parkins of ORR. Most of the refugees receiving public assistance in California receive AFDC. The switch to RCA would eliminate a major disincentive to work—elimination of all assistance for anyone working more than 100 hours per month—that is built into the AFDC system. It would also allow more direct control of referrals into ORR-funded services, particularly employment services, Parkins said.

Tony Smith, California refugee coordinator, said 11,000 clients—AFDC recipients with at least one year of RCA eligibility remaining—were scheduled to be transferred to RCA on October 1. Smith said the project will be delayed because it is dependent on the Fish amendment to the Refugee Act, and reauthorization of the act remains tied up in Congress. The amendment would authorize ORR funds for pilot projects that provide refugee support while encouraging self-sufficiency and reducing welfare dependency.

Disagreement over Immediate Need for Case Management According to Franken, California officials rejected a USCC proposal to develop a statewide case management system simultaneously with the transfer, saying it was more than they could do at this time. They argued that a San Francisco demonstration project already planned for fall implementation by a consortium of voluntary agencies could be treated as a case management demonstration in the context of the RCA transfer.

Smith said, "It seemed more reasonable to test this in San Francisco where systems could be worked out and looked at before moving on it statewide." But he added that state officials were willing to begin discussing a case management system for the state before the San Francisco demonstration effort ended.

Franken understood that the San Francisco project would be funded for 15 to 18 months, then evaluated, before proposals for case management statewide would be considered. This would postpone case management until at least FY 87, Franken said. "The transfer to RCA is a good change, but it can't succeed without an aggressive case management system that can use the incentives afforded by RCA effectively."

In a July 23 letter to ORR director Phillip Hawkes, Donald Hohl, associate director of USCC Migration and Refugee Service, said the California officials made it clear that any voluntary role beyond the initial 90 days would remain minimal. "Certainly the state does not share our sense of urgency that the problem be addressed forthrightly and that new approaches be vigorously pursued." Hohl concluded, "Further, we are extremely alarmed that the state would proceed with the RCA demonstration without considering major adjustments necessary in the service delivery system."

UNACCOMPANIED MINORS RESSETTLEMENT CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL

Over 2,000 unaccompanied minors from Southeast Asia have been resettled to the U.S. since the mid-1970s. U.S. resettlement agencies and foster care workers have overcome many obstacles to provide care for unaccompanied minors due to their special needs and the lack, until recently, of standardized guidelines for the settlement of these youths. Federal funding specifically for unaccompanied minors is limited to Southeast Asians though similar problems face minors from other regions, particularly Central America.

Unaccompanied Minors More Vulnerable Service providers have observed that the trauma of escape and camp experiences likely affect these refugee youths more than
adults or those in family situations. How to nurture their successful adaptation in America has concerned many child care advocates as they sit down to work out programs to care for them.

This concern led U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) to study how unaccompanied minors have fared in their resettlement and how well various program strategies have met their special needs.

Nancy Schulz, USCC coordinator of children's services, and consultant Ann Sontz conducted a survey of the 28 USCC affiliates that have resettled half of all unaccompanied minors who have entered the U.S. Questionnaires were sent to USCC practitioners to complete independently and with the refugee youths. Response to the survey was notably high. The study findings are described in an 86-page report, *Voyagers in the Land*, published in December 1983.

**Successful Integration in Spite of Difficulties** Over half of the youths surveyed were found to suffer from mild to severe depression, whether recognized overtly or by clinical symptoms. One in five minors in the U.S. underwent professional treatment, according to the study. Not surprisingly, a higher incidence of depression was found among those with fewer American friends and lower English skills.

The children were found to be highly resilient, however, as depression did not appear to hinder overall integration to American life. Three-quarters of the youth were considered very successful in their adaptation to school, and English skills of two-thirds were judged to be good to excellent. Nearly all (97 percent) of unaccompanied minors surveyed were in some sort of academic program.

Study director Schulz believes these findings of vulnerability/depression and successful adaptation are not contradictory but rather attest to the "youthful energy" of this population and their pursuit of goals. Schulz says that successful integration does not mean that they do not suffer. "All refugees go through grief and mourning," she commented. "It's those who do not go through it that I worry about."

**Profile of Unaccompanied Refugee Youth** The typical Southeast Asian unaccompanied minor entering the U.S. is described as a Buddhist Vietnamese male, 15 to 17 years old, and under foster care. Four out of five minors surveyed are between the ages of 15 and 18. Two-thirds are Vietnamese, 17 percent ethnic Chinese, 14 percent Khmer, and 3 percent Lao.

One-third of the youths studied made the decision to flee the country themselves, and one-fifth had a parent who had been in a re-education camp at some point.

Most of the surveyed minors lived in foster care at the time of the study, and one-fourth had been "emancipated," or assisted to the point where they could live independently. The majority of the minors surveyed lived in foster care with families of the same ethnic background or American families; 10 percent lived in group homes, and 6 percent lived independently.

Contrary to popular assumptions, living with families of the same ethnic background was not found to impede overall adaptation to schools, language, or in making American friends. The main difference found among those in ethnic foster care was a lower rate of depression and very slightly lower English competency levels.

Though foster care is generally the preferred home situation, the study recommended continuing to make available independent or group living situations for the small number of older or depressed unaccompanied minors who had previously lived independently.

Eight out of ten emancipated youths were found to be working, largely in white collar or electronics fields, and two-thirds attended school as well.

**Problem of Defining Unaccompanied Refugees** In some cases, families have smuggled the children out of Vietnam in an attempt to send one family member to the U.S. Says Lou Johnston of the USCC affiliate in Jackson, Mississippi, "[Parents] want their children to have a 'bright future' in this country." She added, "Some youths come with the burden to bring the rest of their family here, and they get jobs just as soon as they can to support them."

Since refugees defined as unaccompanied minors are granted higher priority to resettle in the U.S., this program has reportedly been abused by people desperate to send a family member to the U.S., according to some who work with refugee processing overseas. Once they arrive in the U.S.,
the minors are sometimes found to be older than they claimed in their applications. Voluntary agencies have called for clear processing guidelines to apply in camp interviews to identify those who genuinely qualify for the program.

Integration More Difficult in Europe

Though the vast majority of unaccompanied minors have resettled in the U.S., efforts in Europe and other regions are also noteworthy. But by comparison to resettlement in the U.S., "other countries have no institutions to absorb [unaccompanied minor] newcomers," said Schulz. In West Germany, for example, integrating the youth in education has been very difficult. She suggested that the system has not been geared to the needs of refugees in the same way that the U.S. educational system has.

Copies of the study, Voyagers in the Land, are available free of charge from Children's Services, USCC, 902 Broadway, New York, NY 10010, telephone (212) 614-1250.

Anti-Piracy Efforts Renewed

This year, piracy attacks are on the rise again, and efforts to prevent attacks or assist the victims are being renewed. The Boat People S.O.S. Committee is a member of the Washington D.C.-based Coalition for the Protection of Vietnamese Boat Refugees, a group of ten organizations working to eliminate pirate attacks on boat refugees. The committee currently seeks funds to help charter a ship to monitor international waters where boat people sail and to assist piracy victims. The six-month project will commence in the fall of 1984, carried out by a French medical organization, Medecins du Monde, in league with a German medical group, Deutches Komite Not Akzte.

The above publication, Pirates on the Gulf of Siam, is available for $4; Report on the Vietnamese Land Refugees costs $6. Send inquiries to Boat People S.O.S. Committee, Dr. Nguyen Huu Xuong, Chair, Boat People S.O.S. Committee, 6970 Linda Vista Rd., San Diego, CA 92111.
Conferences

CONFERENCE HELD ON LONG-RANGE RESETTLEMENT PLANNING IN MASSACHUSETTS

In an unusual public initiative, the Massachusetts Office of Refugee Resettlement (MORR) has spearheaded a long-range state plan to coordinate public and private efforts on the state level—a need widely recognized by program planners.

MORR sponsored a working conference May 18-19 to bring together state and municipal level resettlement actors to define the state's resettlement goals, to clarify roles and relationships, and to point to policy directions for the state.

Daniel Lam, state coordinator of MORR, says the conference was significant in bringing together for the first time representatives of the governor's office, of all major state offices involved in resettlement, municipalities, mayors' offices, private resettlement agencies, and individual sponsors.

The crucial missing link in policymaking has always been the municipal level, according to Lam. "Refugees come to their backyards," he adds, "but they rarely have direct input into decision-making about how resettlement is done."

Merging Interests and Accountabilities

Private and public agencies' attempts to cooperate in long-term resettlement program planning are complicated not only by fluctuations in refugee admissions but also by the ad hoc nature of agencies' operations statewide, Lam says. Local resettlement agencies are accountable to their national headquarters, who in turn answer to the State Department. State administrators, on the other hand, are accountable to state executive offices and federal funders. Municipal authorities have more direct accountability to local inhabitants and interests. A major aim of the May meeting was to coordinate interests and accountabilities in resettlement programs.

One impediment addressed in the conference was how programs and services are shaped around federal funding. Options states have when federal funding for a refugee ceases but his needs remain were discussed.

The way the federal goal of self-sufficiency is defined is inadequate, according to Lam. No more than 15 percent of Office for Refugee Resettlement (ORR) funds to states can be used for "support services." However, these services enable immigrants to become financially self-supportive, Lam asserts. For example, a member of a large family with an entry-level job and no benefits cannot likely make ends meet, and in order for another family member to work, language or day care needs must be met.

Comprehensive Approach

Lam emphasizes that to avoid turning potentially productive immigrants into welfare recipients, a more comprehensive approach must be taken in meeting needs to support the person in a transitional period.

One recommendation of the conference was for actors on the state level to take a more active role in working with federal policy makers to make decisions that are practical and appropriate to the state. This could be accomplished by working through resettlement agencies to influence federal refugee admission and placement policies.

Other recommendations of the conference centered around alternative medical and cash assistance measures that would avert the "welfare recipient" syndrome. "Immigrants must be treated as any other state resident," Lam asserts, "and the key here is integration." As many as 20,000 refugees are now eligible to be permanent residents in Massachusetts, according to MORR.

The Massachusetts legislature took a rare initiative in December 1983 to approve state funding for the WIC program. To rely upon federal funding is "inadequate," Lam states, to meet the actual needs. He notes that since states bear the burden of federal level decisions, there is a need for states to take initiative in overall resettlement policy planning.

The conference stimulated policy directives, Lam suggests, but also set a precedent for a unified effort among public and private participants in resettlement to cooperatively plan and influence resettlement programs and implementation. A report of the conference outcomes is currently being produced by MORR.
SURVIVORS' CONFERENCE SCHEDULED


The conference will discuss the trauma experienced by those who have survived war or mass murder in their home countries and fled as forced migrants or refugees. It will also consider ways to serve their mental and physical health needs. In preparation for the conference, studies, reports, and survivors' testimony are sought.

Contact: Glen Poling, National Conference of Christians and Jews (213) 385-0491 or Andrea Canno, ECUMEDIA (213) 381-6334.

Reader Exchange

* A Cross-Cultural Medical Program for hospitals in the greater metropolitan Chicago area is being offered by the Chicago American Refugee Committee. The program offers information about the medical beliefs, mores, practices, and attitudes of Southeast Asian refugees and other refugee groups. The program has been in effect since October 1983 and will continue through June 30, 1985. Area hospitals that are interested in the program should contact: The American Refugee Committee, 317 Howard Street, Suite 216, Evanston, Illinois 60202. Tel: (312) 328-1620.

Resources

MONTHLY MAGAZINE ON WORLDWIDE REFUGEE SITUATIONS

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees publishes Refugees, a monthly news magazine distributed internationally that covers refugee developments worldwide. Through articles, photos, and interviews, the magazine addresses issues regarding refugee assistance, asylum, protection, and special programs to meet needs of refugees throughout the world. Also included are book reviews and reports on voluntary agency programs. It is available free of charge. To order Refugees, send name and full address to UNHCR, 1785 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 408, Washington, D.C. 20036.

CENTRAL AMERICA RESOURCES

The following publications are available from the Central American Resource Center:

Directory of Central America Organizations, lists 450 groups in the U.S. by geographic location, with description of services and activities. Cross references groups' activities. $8.

Writers Bulletin, an annotated bibliography of current scholarly articles on Central American issues. Cost is $4, or $25 for a 6 issue membership.

Requests for these materials can be sent to Central American Resource Center, P.O. Box 2327, Austin TX 78768. (512) 476-9841.

AUDIO-VISUALS ON CARIBBEAN AND CENTRAL AMERICA

Several audio-visual presentations are available from The Resource Center in New Mexico:

Inside Haiti, a slide show with taped narrative, looks at the lives and work of Haitians and offers reasons why so many are fleeing their homeland. For sale to business/institutions $75; for community groups/individuals $50. Rentals $25 a week.

In Pursuit of Refuge, a 25-minute slide/tape documentation of the people that leave El Salvador and Guatemala as a result of repression and war.

La Frontera, a 25 minute slide/tape show, tells of the lives of Mexican undocumented immigrants in the U.S. and examines the role of U.S. government and industry on the border and in Mexico.

[Both slide/tape shows are available in English or Spanish, and are for sale to business/institutions for $100; to community groups/individuals for $65. Rentals are $25 a week.]
Send requests with fee to The Resource Center, P.O. Box 4506, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87196. Phone: (505) 266-5009.

STUDY OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY IMPACT

SRI International completed in November 1983 Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement at the Local Level: The Role of the Ethnic Community and the Nature of Refugee Impact. After the initial influx of refugees beginning in 1975, practitioners and policy makers became concerned about the role of refugee communities in the resettlement process, and the actual impact of large refugee communities on the local social/economic fabric. The Office of Refugee Resettlement commissioned the SRI study, completed by Christine R. Finnan and Rhonda Ann Cooperstein. Four basic questions are addressed in the 252-page study:

1. What is the structure, function, and development of refugee communities and how do these communities affect the resettlement of refugees?
2. What are the kinds of effects refugees have on localities and what factors influence the nature and degree of these effects?
3. To what extent do the structure, activities, and size of refugee communities influence the effects refugees have on localities? What are the trade-offs between sizable communities and significant impact?
4. Which effects of refugees on localities are inevitable, and which are subject to change? What options are available to federal and local actors to aid refugee resettlement?

The study involved several phases—review of existing information, collection of documents, statistics and field data from five selected counties in the U.S., analysis, and report. Extensive interviews were conducted by staff teams in the study sites.

The SRI study is available from Refugee Materials Center, U.S. Department of Education, 324 E. 11th St., 9th Floor, Kansas City, MO 64104, attn. Bud Tumy.

ORR REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON U.S. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

ORR's annual report to Congress on the refugee resettlement program for FY 83 describes refugee admissions for the year, refugee program appropriations and activities, other federal refugee activities, ORR program evaluations, and resettlement agency programs. It also discusses key demographic and economic characteristics of the refugees resettled in the U.S. since 1975.

Among the studies completed last year was the "Southeast Asian Refugee Self-Sufficiency" study. This study showed that refugees, though poor, make steady progress toward self-sufficiency. While only one-third of refugee households were above the poverty line after one year in the U.S., 70 percent were out of poverty after four years. The welfare dependency rate dropped from approximately 80 percent in the first year to 48 percent after three years.

The most important factor affecting self-sufficiency was the individual refugee's English language ability on arrival in the U.S. Refugees who spoke no English had a labor force participation rate of only 25 percent and an unemployment rate of 36 percent. Those who spoke English fluently participated in the labor force at a rate of 63 percent and had an unemployment rate of 13 percent. Wages for employed refugees were found to be directly proportional to English ability.

For households, having a second adult employed was the most significant factor in achieving self-sufficiency. Some 90 percent of households with two wage earners were out of poverty, compared to 68 percent of the households with only one wage earner.

Another study summarized in the annual report, "Refugees and Their Local Communities," showed a difference between the actual effects of refugees on the communities in which they resettle and public perceptions of the impact. "The public perception that refugees are having a negative impact does not directly derive from these actual effects," the report concluded.

Copies may be ordered from: Bud Tumy, Refugee Materials Center, U.S. Department of Education, 324 E. 11th Street, 9th Fl., Kansas City, MO 64104, (816) 374-2276.
### INDOCHINESE REFUGEES BY ETHNIC GROUP CAMP POPULATIONS AS OF 6/30/84

**General** Refugees in all camps/countries in Southeast and East Asia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Lao</th>
<th>Highlanders</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lao Highlanders</td>
<td>22,131</td>
<td>52,436</td>
<td>53,738</td>
<td>53,097</td>
<td>181,402**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Lao</th>
<th>Highlanders</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Ban Nam Yao</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ban Vinai</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>40,147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Kham</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kab Cherng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khao I Dang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakhon Phanom</td>
<td>17,161</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phanat Nikhom lst Asy</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phanat Nikhom ESL/CO</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sikhilu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Songkhla:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>4,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ubon:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol Repat Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>19,991</td>
<td>52,401</td>
<td>46,833</td>
<td>6,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Pulau Bidong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KL Transit Center/Sungei Besi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Hawkins Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarempa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjung Pinang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galang lst Asylum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galang RPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>555</td>
<td>3,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>555</td>
<td>10,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Palawan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bataan RPC</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>8,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>10,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Open Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL** 22,131 | 52,436 | 53,738 | 53,097

* The Ubon reception center has refugees awaiting movement to Nakhon Phanom, while the boat refugees in the Songkhla reception center are awaiting movement to Sikhiu. The Ubon voluntary repatriation center (Vol Repat Center) holds refugees awaiting voluntary repatriation to Laos.

** Does not include 444 Vietnamese (ODP) refugees in transit in Bangkok.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY*</th>
<th>Cumulative Received This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Granted This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Denied This FY</th>
<th>Pending End of Month</th>
<th>NATIONALITY*</th>
<th>Cumulative Received This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Granted This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Denied This FY</th>
<th>Pending End of Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18,758</td>
<td>6,043</td>
<td>22,622</td>
<td>143,569</td>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGANISTAN</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>LIBERIA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PAKISTAN</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PANAMA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTA RICA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SOMALIA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>116,029</td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>SRI LANKA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>10,076</td>
<td>4,975</td>
<td>SURINAME</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EThIOPIA</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REP.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONDURAS</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>VIETNAM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>YEMEN (SANAA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>YUGOSLAVIA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>ZAIRE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>STATELESS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMPUCHEA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nationalities with fewer than 10 applications pending are omitted from this chart
** Other than Hong Kong

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service
INS GUIDELINES FOR OVERSEAS PROCESSING OF REFUGEES EVALUATED, PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) guidelines, in effect since August 15, 1983, have been effective in making U.S. processing of refugee applicants in Southeast Asia more consistent, humane, and efficient. Sources interviewed by Refugee Reports suggested, though, that some clarification is still needed, particularly to address concerns about the processing of Cambodian refugees.

The guidelines included instructions on how to conduct INS screening interviews and determine refugee status. These were applied worldwide.

But the guidelines also established a series of categories of Southeast Asian refugee applicants determined to "share common characteristics that identify them as targets of persecution in their particular countries." Applicants from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia who could prove they were in one of the established categories do not need to prove individually that they are likely targets of persecution, according to the guidelines. They only need to express fear or actual experience of persecution.

Guidelines Addressed Processing Problems INS established the guidelines in response to criticism of procedures which were hindering the effective processing of refugees, particularly Cambodians. The criticism centered on the low and inconsistent rate of approval of Cambodian refugees in Kamput camp between fall 1982 and summer 1983. INS had denied the applications of 7,000 Cambodians, one-third of those interviewed.

The high rate of rejection aroused fears that Thailand would be unable to continue to offer asylum and that the remaining Cambodian refugees might be forced back across the border into Cambodia.

Alleged unprofessional and inhumane interviewing practices prompted protests by Joint Voluntary Agency (JVA) officials and others. There were also reports of sharp differences between INS officials in the field, on the one hand, and JVA, INS in Washington, and the State Department, on the other. A series of cables from INS in Washington to INS officers in Southeast
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Asia provided guidelines to remedy those problems. But, critics said, the so-called Kamput cables were often ignored.

In May 1983, President Reagan signed a directive ordering a review of refugee policy and Indochinese refugee processing. It specifically required the attorney general to determine whether there were categories of persons with common characteristics identifying them as targets of persecution. The August 1983 INS guidelines were the result of that directive (see Refugee Reports, Vol. III, No. 25; Vol. IV, Nos. 2, 12, 18).

Guidelines "Effective" This summer, as part of the ongoing review of the guidelines and categories, INS called for comments and suggestions from the field. According to Dan Solis of the Office of Refugee Asylum and Parole at INS, comments have been received, but they have not been formally reviewed yet. The overall impression the responses give, he said, is that the guidelines have helped quite a bit.

State Department sources said that the guidelines have been working "superbly." The department is very impressed with the quality of the guidelines document and the "excellent way they are being carried out." This assessment reflects the unanimous sentiment expressed in reports from State Department overseas posts, according to the sources.

Jim Towey, on the staff of Sen. Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.), said, "On the whole, the guidelines have been good." Sen. Hatfield was a prominent critic of refugee processing in Southeast Asia before the guidelines were implemented.

Towey attributed much of the improvement in processing to the efforts of John Schroeder, who took over INS operations in Thailand in the spring of 1983 and was recently appointed INS district director for Southeast Asia, and Doris Meissner, INS executive associate commissioner. "John Schroeder's arrival brought new positive leadership and a whole new spirit of cooperation with the State Department and JVA."

Sources said the real value of the guidelines was in presenting a tangible policy change that allowed officials to make changes in the way things were being done. Alone, even the new guidelines would not guarantee that processing problems would not occur. But they were needed as a demonstration of the political determination to improve the situation.

Khmer Processing Problems Remain Several observers suggest that processing problems still exist. In particular, the guidelines do not give clear criteria for determining whether an applicant for admission to the U.S. was associated with the Khmer Rouge and involved in the persecution of fellow Cambodians. The Immigration and Nationality Act denies refugee status and resettlement in the U.S. for "any person who ordered, incited or otherwise participated" in the persecution of others.

Bob DeVechi of the International Rescue Committee agreed that the guidelines have been very beneficial, but said the question of Khmer Rouge affiliation is the major problem of refugee processing in Southeast Asia.

DeVechi said there are over 14,000 Cambodians whose cases are on hold pending more in-depth interviews. If a JVA pre-screening interview indicates a possible Khmer Rouge connection, he said, the case held for review by a State Department ethnic affairs officer. The backlog has developed due, in part, to an inadequate number of ethnic affairs officers. The number has been increased, but that does not really solve the problem, according to DeVechi.

The people in the field have been asking for guidance on this question from Washington, but it has not yet come. "It doesn't help to have more ethnic affairs officers if they don't know what to look for in the cases," DeVechi said.

An August staff report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations focuses on these difficulties and charges that current guidelines do not spell out what constitutes adequate grounds for rejecting an applicant.

INS and ethnic affairs officers in the field must make their determinations subjectively and with only vague, circumstantial evidence, insufficient resources to verify claims, and "barely competent interpreters." The report says the results, despite interviewers' skill and dedication, are varying rejection/approval rates among interviewers and overall high rejection rates without assurance that guilty parties are identified and innocent ones fairly treated.
Concern Over Residual Khmer Population
Washington-based officials dismiss suggestions of processing-related problems, the report charges, and assume that decisions can be clear-cut because strict standards are being applied and solid evidence of culpability exists. Confident that Khao I Dang--the only remaining Khmer camp in Thailand from which refugee applicants are screened--can be closed by the end of 1984, these officials assume that individuals rejected by the U.S. may be resettled by other countries, and in the end only "hard-core Khmer Rouge" will remain.

However, the report contends, most observers believe that few of those rejected by the U.S. would be accepted by other countries. The potential is for a residual population of 12-15,000. The likely threat remains that they would be pushed by Thailand back across the border, to the outrage of the international community. A disagreement between the U.S. and Thailand, which might lead to a major confrontation, could be avoided, the report continues, "if the U.S. prepares contingency plans...and makes a good faith effort to keep the residual population as small as humanly possible."

Calling for improved working conditions for field officers, creation of a better data base, and a training program for new field officers, the report also recommends an immediate moratorium on the screening of Khmer refugees until detailed guidance for field officers has been developed and improved screening procedures provided.

Senate Gives Processing Guidelines
The Senate Committee on Appropriations has attempted to provide guidance to interviewers faced with determining what degree of Khmer Rouge involvement constitutes grounds for exclusion. Its June 13 report (98-514) accompanying the 1985 appropriations bill for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, and the Judiciary, and related agencies directs INS to process Cambodian refugees in accordance with specific guidelines.

For Cambodians who were not Khmer Rouge leaders, "specific acts of inhumanity or persecution of others would have to be credibly alleged" to justify exclusion, the report states. The intent of Congress is "that criteria of a general nature, such as residence in Pol Pot controlled areas before 1975, would not be considered in themselves as grounds for exclusion." The report also specifies that children who were under 16 when the Khmer Rouge government fell can be excluded only for "established acts of inhumanity or persecution of others."

DeVecchi said, "The language in the Senate report is the most appropriate, creative, and productive way proposed so far to attack the problem."

INS officials had not formally received the Senate Appropriations Committee report and were uncertain about the implications of its directive. They said discussions are being held on the need for guidance on Khmer processing.

Knowledgeable sources indicated that, although the report says the committee "directs" INS to follow its guidelines, such language in a report does not carry any legal authority unless it reflects language contained in the statute itself.

Other Clarification Needed
The processing guidelines need clarification in other areas as well, DeVecchi said. Some of the Southeast Asia categories are felt to be too restrictive. In particular, there are concerns that the two current categories of religious minorities in Vietnam, Catholics and Buddhist monks, should be expanded to include Protestants and other religious groups. Also, for Laos, the Hmong are the only hill tribe designated as a category although there are other hill tribes who were also closely associated with the U.S. during the Vietnam war period.

DeVecchi added that some lack of consistency remains in the application of the guidelines in regard to minors. "There is not a mutually agreed upon understanding of the criteria for minors, and they should be clarified."

The August 1983 processing guidelines established categories for Southeast Asia processing only, but stated that similar categories should be developed for other refugee-sending areas of the world as the Indochinese guidelines are reviewed. INS sources said that such categories have not yet been developed, but that they are reviewing possible categories for processing in Europe.
Recent Developments

CONGRESS TELLS ORR TO RESTORE SOCIAL SERVICES ALLOCATION LEVEL

Congress has instructed the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to increase its FY 84 funding for refugee and entrant social services from the $44.4 million in ORR's FY 84 estimated budget to the FY 83 level of $71.7 million. The Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill 1984, signed by President Reagan on August 22, also requires that not less than $77.5 million be made available for targeted assistance.

The legislation resolved a conflict that arose early this year between Congress and the administration over interpretation of the "current rate of operations" clause of the continuing resolutions which authorized FY 84 funding for the refugee resettlement program.

As a result of the legislation, ORR will issue revised funding levels for social services and targeted assistance. Dick Parkins of ORR said social services allocations will increase from the levels published in the Federal Register in February for some states, but not all. ORR must obligate the new funds before September 30, the end of FY 84. But, because the funds are allocated after August 1, states can carry them over to FY 85 without affecting their FY 85 allocations, Parkins said.

The targeted assistance provision simply restores the level originally budgeted for FY 84. ORR had transferred part of this year's targeted assistance allocation to social services to guarantee that states would receive 90 percent of their FY 83 social services allocation levels, Parkins said.

A Federal Register notice of the revised social services allocations to states and the increased targeted assistance allocations for affected counties is expected by mid-September.

CONGRESS MAKES HIGHER LEVEL LAW In late March 1984, Congressman Don Edwards (D-Cal.) requested an interpretation of the "current rate" clause from the Government Accounting Office (GAO), but that request is still in process. In the meantime, the House report of July 27 on the supplemental appropriations bill stated that the committee expected the secretary of HHS to "seek, without delay, a revised apportionment of the social services funds compatible with its written statements to the Committee." According to Stephens, to clarify the intent of Congress and to strengthen its directive to the administration, the conference committee wrote the higher funding level into the final bill.
ORR sources indicated that new state allocations will reflect the most current refugee population figures. These will incorporate new secondary migration date and successful challenges to the state refugee population figures published in February. Social services allocations for FY 84 are based on the number of refugees in a state who have arrived in the U.S. in the last 12 months, reduced by factors to account for those refugees who do not actually participate in refugee social services.

SENATE STAFF REPORT SUGGESTS ALTERNATIVES TO RESETTLEMENT BE STRESSED

Restraint in refugee admissions from Southeast Asia is the recommendation of a staff report for the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy submitted in August. While resettlement unquestionably must continue in the foreseeable future, the report urges that other permanent solutions be given higher priority than they are currently assigned.

In particular, the U.S., UNHCR, and other participants should pursue negotiations about repatriation to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Further, UNHCR should undertake more careful sorting out of true refugees from the migrant flow. Citing surveys and spot checks of recent arrivals in Thailand, the report states that a growing number in this flow are economic migrants.

Suspension of Khmer Processing Called For

The report recommends that processing of "P-6" Khmer from Khao-I-Dang be suspended until congressional consultations on FY 85 admissions are conducted.

Since 1975, it recounts, the U.S. has admitted 103,000 Khmer refugees who were in the categories of highest priority. The remaining population—which numbers about 40-50,000—is described as having no relatives in the U.S. or connections to this country or its involvement in Cambodia, and therefore is of lowest priority for resettlement. The report questions the wisdom of commitment increasingly scarce admissions numbers to resettle people in this category. Doing so "can only mortgage future resettlement numbers for future refugees in higher priorities who may have stronger ties and claims to America's attention," the report states.

It was never intended that the U.S. undertake to resettle all Khmer in Khao I Dang, though preliminary screening has been concluded for this group, the report states. The population in the camp is not much different, it continues, from the more than 200,000 Khmer at the Thai-Cambodia border for whom resettlement is not now an option.

The report, however, recommends that the U.S. not substantially reduce its admission level for Indochinese for FY 85 and that the Orderly Departure Program be expanded to 20,000 within that ceiling. A separate ceiling should be established for reeducation camp inmates and their families—numbering about 10,000—who are "the very people for whom the Indochinese refugee program was created to receive," the report states.

AMERASIAN IMMIGRATION MAY BE JEOPARDIZED BY POLITICAL DIFFERENCES

The plight of Amerasian children is an obscured but enduring legacy of decades of American military presence in Asia. Having typically Western physical features, Amerasians stand out in Asian societies, and are often cited as victims of ethnic discrimination and adverse economic conditions, and reminders of national antagonisms. In Vietnam, Amerasians are estimated to number between 8,000 and 10,000.

Since initial moves to bring Vietnamese Amerasians to the U.S. began in 1982, over 3,000 in Ho Chi Minh City alone have been approved to emigrate to the U.S. Yet sharp differences exist between the U.S. and Vietnam over the mechanism for their emigration. According to some sources, the conflict threatens to undermine future prospects for Amerasians coming to the U.S.

The problem stems from Vietnam's resentment that the U.S. processes Amerasians as refugees. In their view, children of servicemen or other Americans during U.S. occupation of Vietnam are a direct responsibility of our government, and their being labeled as refugees—implying that they are victims of persecution—is inaccurate. U.S. officials, on the other hand, maintain the view that Vietnam is holding back on their commitment to release Amerasians and trying to create a political problem. Lack of
diplomatic ties between Vietnam and the U.S. makes communication that could lead to resolution in the conflict difficult.

Veterans Group "Trips" onto the Issue  In December 1981, a Vietnam Veterans of America (VVA) delegation paid a visit to Vietnam to negotiate with government officials about servicemen still listed as missing in action, effects of herbicide defoliants such as Agent Orange, and other issues of mutual concern. VVA Director of Operations Greg Kane told Refugee Reports that VVA became concerned about the fate of Amerasian children because "we were literally tripping over the [Amerasian] kids in the streets." VVA subsequently brought its concerns about the fate of Amerasians to their discussions with Vietnamese officials. By 1982, pressure was mounting from various parties for Vietnam to release the children of U.S. citizens.

In May 1982, Vietnam's foreign minister made an unexpected announcement of a new government policy to release Amerasians to emigrate. "At that time," Kane stated, "they made it very clear not to use ODP (Orderly Departure Program) as the channel."

In the U.S., efforts were undertaken to receive the children. Congress was confronted with a need for enabling legislation regarding a situation not well known previously. Legislation drafted originally to assist Korean Amerasians, which had been revised in 1979-80, was reworked to fit the Vietnam case.

Voluntary agencies involved in resettlement and child welfare geared up to determine how Amerasians would be processed and cared for in American legal and service delivery mechanisms, as well as what their placement needs might be. The American Council of Voluntary Agencies (ACVA) established a task force to study the situation and coordinate programs for their settlement. Representatives of resettlement and child welfare agencies sat on the task force, as well as some other interested private organizations, such as VVA and the Pearl Buck Foundation. Today the task force is a consultative body to INS on processing for Amerasian children.

Congress Supports Bringing Amerasians to the U.S.  In mid-1982, Sen. Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.), who had spent years as a prisoner-of-war in Vietnam, and Rep. Stewart McKinney (R-Conn.) re-introduced Amerasian legislation, P.L. 97-359, otherwise known as the Amerasian Act. The law was passed on the last day of the session in September 1982, and was signed into law at the White House two weeks later. (The full issue of Refugee Reports, Vol. IV, No. 4, Feb. 25, 1983, discusses issues surrounding that legislation.)

The act allowed for Amerasians to be admitted for entry to the U.S. on the basis of documents proving they have an American parent, or on the basis of their physical features—a rare provision in U.S. immigration practices. Specifications designed to protect the children in their placements required home visits to prospective foster families and that families' income level be at least 50 percent over the poverty level.

In spite of the support Congress demonstrated for Amerasian emigration, these and other provisions of the legislation were found to be of limited applicability for Amerasians in Vietnam. For example, though Amerasians could enter with spouses and children, the parents or guardians of minors in the home country would be required to "irrevocably release" them. That would mean in many cases that the minors would have no family in the U.S. Perhaps most problematic, however, was the fact that applying for immigration in Vietnam under the Amerasian Act was next to impossible because of the absence of a U.S. consular presence in Vietnam.

State Department Mandated to "Enact the Spirit of the Law"  Since the passage of that legislation, only a handful of Amerasians are reported to have applied under the law, and most of those were already students in the U.S., according to Frank Sieverts of the State Department's Bureau for Refugee Programs. The act facilitated entry to the U.S. for many Amerasians, but not for those in Vietnam.

It is a commonly held view that the Amerasian Act was passed without full recognition of its ramifications. Due to the difficulties encountered, the task of enacting the "spirit of the law" was turned over to the State Department. It was decided that Amerasians in Vietnam would be processed along with their mothers and siblings through the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), and regulations were
adjusted to add a new category for them.

Amerasians Trickle In As the Amerasian Act was being debated in Congress, the first group of Amerasians left Vietnam and was reunited with their American families, some having been inadvertently separated in the 1975 U.S. pullout from Vietnam. Those and very few others came as documented U.S. citizens. Under the adjusted provisions of ODP, family reunification cases might enter the U.S. as immigrants or citizens. However, most Amerasians are not claimed by their fathers (which would make them eligible for entry as citizens), and 95 percent of Amerasian entrants have come under the category of refugees.

Amerasians have trickled into the U.S. in a steady flow since that time, still via ODP. In general, UNHCR handles negotiations and travel arrangements for ODP departures. As of August 1984, the State Department reports that 1,400 Amerasians had emigrated to the U.S. along with 1,600 accompanying relatives. Less than one in ten Amerasians comes unaccompanied, according to ACVA Children Subcommittee Chair Marta Brenden.

Applications for 30,000 Amerasians from Vietnam have been approved for ODP. State Department figures show that all persons entering the U.S. via ODP average about 1,000 per month, and Amerasians comprise about 100-200 of those. The children come to Tan Son Nhut airport in Ho Chi Minh City together with ODP refugees. Previously, they were flown from there to Thailand for processing, arriving in the U.S. within two weeks.

More recently, however, Amerasians have been brought to the Philippines for processing and six months of English and cultural orientation classes. Because of the discriminatory treatment Amerasians experience in Vietnam, resettlement personnel in the U.S. have voiced concern that this policy might produce more problems than benefits for the children.

ACVA's refugee and migration subcommittee on children is concerned about those Amerasians and their families who enter as refugees, according to Subcommittee Chair Sieverts. The committee does not deal with those who enter under the Amerasian Act of 1982. "Traditional resettlement strategies are not appropriate for Amerasian families," Brenden said, explaining that the

Dispute Centers Around Status of and Responsibility for Amerasians A dispute has been brewing since May 1982, when Vietnam first agreed to release the children, according to VVA. The root of the problem lies in divergent views about Amerasians.

Sieverts said that the State Department "is willing to accept any Amerasians released to us."

Vietnam made clear from the beginning, according to Kane, that they originally allowed the release of Amerasians through ODP only as a stop-gap measure, not intending for this to become the main mechanism for processing them. That the U.S. has continued to process them through refugee admissions procedures is a sore spot in current relations between the two governments.

The Vietnamese government requires voluntary agencies to come to Vietnam to sign for each individual Amerasian child that comes to the U.S. through ODP. To some observers, this rare practice is seen as symbolizing Vietnam's opposition to bringing them through a refugee channel.

The report of WA's April 1984 trip to Vietnam states, "It was clear from WA's discussion with the Vietnamese that the fate of the Amerasian children concerned Vietnam more than any other issue that was addressed. Vietnam would like direct discussions with the United States on this issue as they believe its resolution is a direct and moral responsibility of the U.S. government."

Amerasians in ODP Refugee Quota Problematic Processing Amerasians as refugees under ODP, in effect, may limit access by other eligible applicants under the refugee admissions ceiling. The backlog of Amerasian cases accepted and awaiting processing also limits access to the program for those Amerasians living outside of Ho Chi Minh City.

The U.S. complains, on the other hand, that Vietnam holds back people they do not
want to release through ODP, including
Amerasians. According to U.S. government
sources, Vietnam has announced that they
have a list of thousands of Amerasians they
will release if the U.S. agrees to process
them through a non-refugee quota. They have
reportedly agreed to accelerate their re-
lease of Amerasians if the U.S. ceases
working with UNHCR through ODP, and estab-
lishes a new non-refugee channel.

Kane said that this is not a new set of
demands, though "State [Department] may
have chosen to believe that ODP was the
accepted channel."

VVA believes the U.S. should gain con-
gressional consent to bring Amerasians in
Vietnam to the U.S. under humanitarian
parole.

Meanwhile, Amerasian children grow older
in a society where they are a constant,
though undesired, reminder of national an-
tagomisms, and they can anticipate waiting
on the sidelines until political differ-
ences are resolved and the path is paved
for a more normalized future.

VIETNAMESE AMERASIANS "COME HOME"

An 8-year old boy sat in the living room
of his new home laughing for some time,
hugging himself. Somewhat alarmed, his
American foster parents called in their
Vietnamese child to translate into English
what this curly brown-haired boy was saying.
An Amerasian, born of mixed American and
Vietnamese parentage, the boy had emigrated
just one week earlier to the land of his
American father. "Just look!" he was ex-
claiming, "Just look around this room and
outside, and see all the people that look
just like me." Coming from a country where
ethnic purity is valued and patriarchal her-
itage identifies the individual, "that says
it all—he is accepted here," commented Joan
Rudnick, Director of Minnesota Lutheran So-
cial Services Program for Unaccompanied
Minors.

America's Legacy in Vietnam There are an
estimated 8,000-10,000 Amerasians in Viet-
nam, children born of U.S. servicemen or
other Americans during U.S. involvement in
Vietnam. Amerasians are the "visible sign
of American occupation of Vietnam," said
David Rosenberger, social work supervisor
for the unaccompanied minors program of
Lutheran Service Association of New England.

A backlog of 3,000 Amerasians in Ho Chi
Minh City await processing to emigrate to
the U.S. "The soldiers could leave in 1975
but these kids couldn't. It's a sad legacy.
They are the ones who are finally coming
home." And, he adds that coming home is
the expectation the children have. Upon
arrival here, often equipped with photos or
dogtags of fathers they rarely know about,
they seek the missing link with their
heritage.

Since the first arrivals towards the end
of 1982, 1400 Amerasians have entered the
U.S. along with 1600 family members, accord-
ing to the State Department. Although a
small percentage of Amerasians reunite with
fathers or both parents in the U.S., the
vast majority come unaccompanied or with
their mothers and siblings from Vietnam.

An image commonly portrayed by the media
is that Amerasians in Vietnam are all street
kids, though many actually live in extended
families, according to Rudnick.

Symbols of deep antagonisms, Amerasians
in Vietnam are commonly viewed as scorned
members of the community. Likewise, there
is some speculation that Amerasians receive
harsher treatment by their Vietnamese
families than other children.

Scores of Amerasians live in orphanages
in Ho Chi Minh City, Danang, and other urban
areas of Vietnam. Though not easily acces-
sible to outside observers, the centers are
thought to be overcrowded and understaffed
by American standards. In describing the
conditions in Vietnamese orphanages,
Rosenberger said, "It reminds me of Oliver
Twist," referring to a rigorous lifestyle
that includes full-time piecework in a
factory. Others dispute that assessment.

Greater Shock Upon Arrival Whereas other
refugees have time in transit or in camps
to grieve their losses and "make the mental
step forward" to start a new life in a
foreign country, Amerasian children do not
have that opportunity, Rudnick stated.
They are usually in their new foster homes
within two weeks of leaving their homeland.
It takes Amerasians a few weeks or even
months to learn the new culture and "find
out which end is up," she added.

One difficulty faced by Amerasians in
their adaptation, according to social
workers, is that because of their appearance, they are often expected to speak English. Many have dominantly Caucasian features, but generally do not speak English upon arrival. Consequently, they may be treated as abnormal or even deficient in language abilities. By comparison to other Asians in the acculturation process, Amerasians are sometimes not given the special learning attention they need by school teachers. "They know the child is in the same position as a refugee," explained Rudnick, "but expectations gradually rise for Amerasians because they don't look Asian."

By comparison to other Southeast Asian unaccompanied minors, Amerasian children tend to be younger, physically smaller, medically neglected, and more frightened than other minors who have settled through the American, Massachusetts, office, Rosenberger has found.

Amerasians Developmental Needs Are Great

Rudnick told of a psychologist's assessment of skill level of Amerasian adolescents. Concerned about what appeared to be low-functioning of Amerasians, the study found that rather than being deficient in knowledge or skills, Amerasians tend to be very bright but culturally disadvantaged. Their language and skills profiles were found to be not unlike those of children of less-advantaged American families. This, coupled with less education and lower self-concept, is manifest in poor overall competency levels among Amerasian children.

In her position overseeing Amerasian casework for Lutheran Social Service in Minnesota, Rudnick explained that unaccompanied Amerasian children suffer from a "developmental lag," a need to catch up with experiences they perhaps did not have as a child. Older teenagers spending extended hours with children's coloring books or dolls may seem unusual to American foster families, but demonstrate their needs.

To address the developmental lag problem, Rudnick said case workers in her program encourage role-models among the children--particularly Black Amerasians--who tend to suffer a lower self-concept, she says. Black football players and Michael Jackson are "adored by Black and White alike," she said, and therefore help to engender more rounded and positive ideas about their race and identity.

Though other unaccompanied Southeast Asian children assisted by service providers tend to be reserved and shy, Amerasians have more often been found to have "outward" behaviors, somewhat more aggressive. Rosenberg saw this as perhaps positive, that they are able to work out their feelings and frustrations, particularly in the very early stages of their settlement experience. Further, younger Amerasian children "climb on your lap immediately," Rudnick said, though other Southeast Asian children tend to be "standoffish." She sees overall a higher need for affection and lower trust levels among the Amerasian children assisted by their agency.

New Experiences with Family Life

For one 12-year-old Amerasian girl who spent all her life in orphanages, arriving in the U.S. last spring opened many doors. Though she started fifth grade at the end of the school year, she has not only adapted to the classwork and typical adolescent activities of Americans, but she has come from speaking almost no English to being able to converse comfortably.

According to her new mother, a single parent with several other teenagers in her "team-spirit" home, the inability to express herself at first brought on some rebellious outbursts, but these diminished as she progressed in her language ability. She now assists other Vietnamese speakers with their English, and she has even taken on the role of tutor for a mentally retarded Asian boy in the home. "She's very patient with him. Her ability to grasp English so well has really helped him. His ego has skyrocketed."

As a Black Amerasian in a community where being bi-racial is common, she has a chance to start fresh without an automatic stigma. "The kids at summer school are all amazed at her math work," her foster mother explained. "She works out a problem on paper before the other kids can check her on the calculator." She used to do all she could to learn where possible in Vietnam, she added. "In the orphanage in Vietnam, she used to wake up at 5 a.m. and do all her morning chores to be able to attend a few hours of school before doing her full day of work making baskets," her mother added.

The girl also talks a lot about her
father, whom she never met. All she knows is that he is in this country. The girl has agreed to wait until she is older to try to trace him. But for now, "She really considers us as her family," her foster mother said. "She doesn't just call me her mother, I am her mother."

A locally organized support group for single foster parents of Asian children has helped tremendously to bridge difficulties this foster mother has encountered. She feels that many parents have more problems than she in their experiences with foster children.

The foster family is the main support unit in the care of Amerasian children, Rosenberger explained. Lutheran Services works very closely through bilingual caseworkers to support, in turn, the families in the process. "The bilingual caseworkers have been absolutely invaluable," he explained, bringing both American and Asian perspectives critical in handling the child's needs and family problems.

Finding Fathers a Delicate Issue Though Amerasian children may come to the U.S. with the fantasy of finding their fathers and an American family, this could prove disastrous. For most, the fathers have not filed papers to trace them. Many are assumed to have begun new lives and new families, and may want to bury the consequences of their past experiences in Vietnam.

The social service agencies that place Amerasians at times get requests to trace fathers in the U.S. or children in Vietnam. However, they make it clear that they are not in the business of tracing, for logistical as well as legal reasons.

The issue of the "lost" American father is often raised by public assistance caseworkers who are obligated by law to trace an absent parent and determine his/her financial resources. This raises a host of ethical, logistical, and privacy issues for the public and private service community, sources suggest. Presently the fathers of Amerasians are "shielded" from such tracing by privacy regulations in foster care situations. But as the children grow older, and in the event large numbers of Amerasian children emigrate to the U.S. in coming years, the service delivery sector may force the issue to the forefront.

Projects and Programs

ORR CHANGES IN MAA INCENTIVE GRANTS REFLECT DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNIC SELF-HELP GROUPS

Three changes in the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) incentive grants to states for mutual assistance associations (MAAs) reflect the success of the program and ORR's commitment to MAA development, according to officials of the federal agency.

For FY 84, the allocation to states for the incentive grants has been increased to $3,316,310 from the previous year's $917,478. The allocation for FY 82, the first year of the grant program, was $791,462.

Also, the FY 84 funds will be allocated to states according to the number of refugees and entrants in each state who have arrived in the U.S. in the last three years. Any state which assured ORR by August 1 that it would meet certain conditions--mostly guaranteeing that the funds would go to MAAs for new or expanded service provision--could receive its allocation, according to a July 2 memorandum from ORR director Phillip Hawkes. Written assurances were received from all but six states. Those were states with very small refugee populations whose allocations would have been minimal, according to Dick Parkins of ORR.

In the past, ORR competitively selected states for MAA incentive grant allocations. In FY 83, 14 states received such funds. A "hold harmless" clause protects states who received FY 83 allocations from having their allocations reduced.

Commitment Becoming Institutionalized In the first two years of the program, incentive grant allocations came from ORR national discretionary project funds. The FY 84 allocation is from regular ORR social services funds. According to Dick Shapiro of ORR, all of these changes represent an institutionalization of ORR's commitment to MAA development.

The program arose out of meetings in the spring of 1982 to discuss ORR's direction in regard to MAAs, Shapiro explained. ORR's FY 83 Report to the Congress states that the first purpose of the incentive grants...
As to "encourage broader participation of MAAs in the delivery of social services to refugees through integration of MAAs by states within their existing refugee service provision network." The aim was to help states which had not been able to support MAAs, as well as those which had funded them and wanted to continue.

The FY 83 grants were to provide an incentive to states to contract with MAAs to provide employment services, English language training, critical mental health services, and orientation services.

Shapiro said ORR viewed the FY 82 program as a success, enabling MAAs to be competitive and to help members of their communities achieve self-sufficiency. The FY 83 program was also seen as highly effective in breaking down barriers and resistance to MAAs' growing participation in refugee programs. As a result, ORR reduced the bureaucratic requirements by requiring only a simple certification process for states, and the money allocated to the program was increased significantly.

"This process reflects ORR grappling with the issue and evolving a very affirmative policy of encouraging refugee community organizations to have a role in developing self-sufficiency in their communities," Shapiro said. "ORR is committed to that goal."

**Building Sound Community Organizations**

ORR's Region V contains four of the states--Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Ohio--that received MAA incentive grant awards in FY 83. Derek Schoen, Region V director, told Refugees Reports that MAA development is a high priority in that region. "Eventually federal funding of refugee programs will dry up, and it is important to leave behind sound community-based and community-funded organizations with some experience in providing services," Schoen said. "The MAA incentive grant program is ORR's top achievement. It has helped build solid MAAs that are very functional and able to provide services and locate their own funding sources."

Schoen added that ORR Director Hawkes' support of MAA development has been important. "The decision to make FY 84 an allocation, not a competitive award, to states and the increase in the allocation to $3.6 million in spite of limited overall funds really showed ORR's commitment," he said.

The states in Region V are proud of the MAAs and what they have done, Schoen went on, and the voluntary agencies have been generally supportive of MAA development.

Schoen cited recent developments in Illinois as one example of the impact of MAA incentive grants. Illinois awarded all contracts for refugee services on a competitive basis this year and designed requests for proposals to encourage MAA participation. Proposal evaluation criteria awarded ten points for proposals with MAA linkages. As a result, MAAs won contracts for most of the employment services in the Chicago area.

Schoen said that, while most states have been willing to have MAAs provide "softer" services, Illinois has moved especially fast in getting MAAs involved in "hard services" like job development and placement, where they have tough contract quotas to meet.

### Providing Employment Services

In Chicago this year, according to Schoen, all job development and placement services for Vietnamese and Cambodians are being provided by two MAAs. The Cambodian Assistance Project submitted a successful joint proposal with three voluntary agencies and will provide employment services to all Chicago-area Cambodians.

The Vietnamese Community Service Center, the service arm of the Vietnamese Association of Illinois, was awarded a joint contract with Travelers and Immigrants Aid of Chicago. They began providing employment services in July, according to Noang Le, director of the center. She added that the center had already been providing individual and family adjustment counseling, orientation, legal assistance, interpretation and translation, and community outreach services with MAA incentive grant funds.

Noang Le said the MAA incentive grants "opened the door" for MAAs to develop by supporting services from special funds initially so they were not perceived as competition to other programs. The ORR initiative enabled MAAs not only to provide services, but to help build their communities. "The MAA incentive grant program is like what happened with civil rights," Noang Le said. "Sometimes it takes the federal
government to take the initiative to encourage states to support changes. This was true with the development of MAAs."

Noang Le stressed the importance of MAAs and her gratitude for ORR's strong position in support of them. "It has been nine years since the first Vietnamese refugees arrived, and all that time resettlement has been viewed as individuals and families," she said. "Now the needs are those of communities trying to establish themselves. Individuals need communities."

When refugee-specific program funds begin to diminish, Noang Le added, "refugees will still have each other to help. We need to be prepared for that time. With sufficient support in the transition period, we can do it." Noang Le is optimistic about the future of MAAs because their development is a high priority for ORR. With strong support from ORR and the state, she said, MAAs flourish. She hopes that the MAA incentive grant allocations will encourage more states to help build MAAs.

Positive Change Schoen said Wisconsin was a leader in its commitment to MAAs. Wisconsin's firm commitment to client involvement in program planning in general, the willingness of voluntary agencies to help refugee groups even if it means ultimate decreases in their own funding, and the separate seed money made available by the MAA incentive grants have contributed to the strength of the state's MAAs, said Sue Levy, refugee coordinator for Wisconsin.

"I feel very strongly that the MAA incentive grant is one of the best things the government ever did in terms of positive change in the refugee programs," Levy commented. She added that she was pleased that ORR institutionalized the program in a regular allocation system.

Wisconsin has made a real commitment to MAA development in funds and staff, Levy said. One staff person works full-time on MAA technical assistance and another nearly full-time. Of approximately $1.3 million going to refugee services in Wisconsin this year, nearly one-third—$409,000, including the state's $75,000 ORR incentive grant— is going to 11 MAAs. Yet Levy estimates that the state coordinator's office funds only about 50 percent of total MAA budgets in the state.

The capacity to generate a variety of funds was mentioned by several sources as an important accomplishment of MAAs. Dave Doyle, MAA liaison in the Wisconsin coordinator's office, provides technical assistance to MAAs. In June, one of the regular two-day in-service training workshops for MAAs focused on grantsmanship, Doyle said.

As an example of MAAs' success in gaining access to other funds, Doyle cited the Hmong Association of Brown County in Green Bay. Its director, Koua Yang, reported that the association is receiving funds this year from the Campaign for Human Development, the Gannett Corporation (Green Bay Press-Gazette), NEWCAP, Brown County Department of Social Services, the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, and a city block grant. The association is currently working with the local United Way to determine the amount of that agency's grant. Doyle said four or five MAAs were receiving United Way funds. Others have also received VISTA, JTPA, Title V Older American Workers, and county and state health department contracts.

The Wisconsin MAAs have been successful, not only in competing for funds, but in providing services. Levy said the state's MAAs had achieved their annual contract goals in the first six months of this fiscal year.

MAAs Provide a Structure But both Levy and Doyle emphasized that service provision is not the only benefit of MAAs. They improve the services of all agencies the state funds, Levy said, by providing refugee involvement in the planning process. While refugee participation in program planning has been a goal for a long time, it was not possible without organized advocacy groups. MAAs provide a structure for needs assessment, advocacy, and planning. Doyle said the MAAs in Wisconsin work extensively with regular service providers to help them recognize and address refugee needs.

Levy pointed to the ORR strategy of encouraging multiple wage-earner households in order to reduce public assistance dependency as another area where MAAs' role is crucial. Without MAAs to deal with the cultural impediments to work for women, older people, and youth, to develop culturally appropriate day care, to deal with family strain, and to motivate people, pursuing the goal of second wage-earner households...
ill be very difficult, Levy said. MAA's still have problems, however. Doyle said they often lack clarity about what services they should provide, tend to try to do too much, and do not fully understand services already available. The result is some initial duplication of services.

There are still political factions and clan rivalries that cause problems, especially in hiring. Some refugees tend to bring problems to an MAA that they were dealing with themselves, thus reducing their self-sufficiency and their involvement in other community structures. Doyle said this is especially true when an MAA is first funded and staff overextends itself, creating too many expectations. He encourages MAAs to avoid fostering new dependency relationships by making decisions about what services they can appropriately provide.

Need to Establish a Base These are the sorts of problems that make funding like the MAA incentive grants so important, Doyle said. He feels that it takes two or three years for an MAA to establish its own funding base, develop administrative skills and a strong staff, and learn how to work in the political system. Thus, Doyle concluded, it is essential to provide MAAs with adequate funding long enough for them to become viable and effective and to make informed decisions about what kind of organization they want to be.

Schoen stressed the advantages MAAs have in reaching a point of being viable, competitive service providers. They generally have simple, and often shared, facilities, relatively low staff costs, access to volunteers, knowledge of the community, and incentive to make programs work. Schoen said, "Soon it won't be a matter of states saying, 'Let's be nice to MAAs.' It will be a matter of MAAs competing." As of October 1, all Region V states will award their refugee service contracts on a competitive basis.

YOU DESERVE A BREAK TODAY: TAX CREDIT ENCOURAGES MCDONALD'S, OTHER EMPLOYERS TO HIRE TARGETED GROUPS

A recently extended program of federal tax credits for employers who hire certain economically disadvantaged people is one reason McDonald's has made refugees a recruiting priority. The Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC) was extended through 1985 by a provision of the deficit reduction bill signed into law by President Reagan on July 18.

McDonald's national headquarters in Oakbrook, Illinois, has specifically identified refugee organizations as recruitment resources, according to Carla Palmquist, community relations representative for the company in northern Virginia.

Palmquist said McDonald's recruits refugees, first, because they are good workers. "Their strongest point is their desire to work and to work very hard. The motivation is very, very high," she said. She described McDonald's refugee employees as industrious, conscientious, and reliable. "We wouldn't continue recruiting them if they weren't so good," Palmquist added.

TJTC an Incentive to Hire Economically Disadvantaged The Targeted Jobs Tax Credit is another reason McDonald's tries to hire refugees. TJTC reduces the taxes of employers who hire from nine categories of people who have difficulty finding work. For refugees who fall into those categories, Palmquist said, TJTC can be an important selling point to a potential employer.

Originally authorized by the Economic recovery Tax Act of 1981, TJTC was designed to give employers added incentive to hire from groups with chronically high unemployment, according to Norma Quirk, TJTC coordinator for Virginia. Of the nine targeted groups, most refugees who qualify are youth, between 18 and 24, from economically disadvantaged families, Quirk said. General assistance and AFDC recipients are also eligible, but not those receiving refugee cash assistance, she explained.

An employer who hires a targeted worker can qualify for a tax credit of 50 percent of the worker's first year wages up to $6,000 and 25 percent of the second year wages up to $6,000. This means a tax credit of as much as $3,000 for the employee's first year on the payroll and $1,500 for the second year. Steve McManus of the U.S. Employment and Training Administration emphasized that the credit applies only to business and trade; household employees cannot qualify.

A special provision for summer employment of disadvantaged youth, 16 and 17 years old,
allows a credit of 85 percent of the first $3,000 in wages of new employees for up to 90 days between May 1 and September 15.

Red Tape Minimized Quirk said the program is designed to be free of burdensome paperwork for the employer. An eligible employee must get a voucher from the state job service office or other agency authorized to certify eligibility. The voucher tells the employer that the worker is eligible for the program. The employer must then fill out a simple form and mail it to the job service before the worker's starting date. The business will then receive a certificate of eligibility that allows it to claim the credit on regular tax forms.

If an employer thinks a prospective employee is eligible, he may send a letter stating that to the job service before employment begins; certification will be done later. Jim Pugh of the Virginia Employment Commission emphasized that a written request for certification must be on record with the local job service before work begins. Once someone begins working, it is too late to initiate eligibility certification.

Large Franchise Companies Utilize TJTC Sources indicated that the fast food industry is vitally interested in TJTC and had lobbied for its continuation. Quirk said that many companies have developed aggressive policies to try to recruit target members. Some large franchise companies have hired consulting firms to identify and screen prospective eligible employees. Pugh thought that major employers have been taking advantage of TJTC but that smaller employers may not know about it.

According to Palmquist, the tax credit could be most valuable to small businesses. A brochure published by the National Alliance of Business points out that the lower the employer's tax bracket, the higher are the savings.

Quirk said that awareness of TJTC among refugee groups is uneven. In northern Virginia, it is used heavily. In other places, more education about the program is required. Because refugees have proven to be good workers and because sponsors and job developers have been willing to work hard to find them jobs, some have found jobs without seeking the voucher. Often, when the employers find out about TJTC and realize the refugee employees would have been eligible, they are disappointed, Quirk said.

"TJTC is a tremendous program, a merger between the private sector and government that benefits both the employer and the employee, but a lot of people don't know about it, including refugees and some counselors," Palmquist said. Those who are eligible but who do not have a voucher to show a prospective employer are losing one of their biggest advantages, she said. "The voucher says, 'Give me a chance and you'll get 50 percent back on my training time.' It makes him or her a more attractive prospect."

Fast Food Work Has Pros and Cons for Refugees Palmquist said working on a crew gives a young person good job experience and a good job record. McDonald's does not view a crew position as a career and anticipates a high turnover rate among its employees. "It's a good starting place, a good first job." She added that the large number of employees at a McDonald's store allows for flexible work schedules which can be important for refugees who have a lot of responsibilities and may be enrolled in school or special language or training programs.

McDonald's main problem in hiring refugees is not being able to find enough, Palmquist said. Elaine Squeri of the Refugee Education and Employment Program in Arlington, Virginia, said several factors discourage refugees from applying to McDonald's. Most important is the low pay and the lack of benefits, particularly health insurance. Refugees know they will lose their public medical assistance if they work, and they know the costs of medical care so jobs without employer-paid health insurance are not attractive to them.

Another drawback, Squeri reported, is the part-time and often erratic hours. For refugees living far from work, commuting by bus for a short shift may not be practical. She agreed with Palmquist that, in some cases, McDonald's managers have arranged full-time hours for good workers.

Squeri also hesitates to place refugees in jobs at McDonald's because their English will not improve in such work. Palmquist said McDonald's will hire people with low English language ability but they are limited to tasks without customer contact,
mostly cooking and cleaning, where their chances of improving their English and advancing are slight. Because McDonald's is a service business, English proficiency is essential for most crew members.

**TJTC a Marketing Tool** Squeri said that refugee employment counselors try to use TJTC whenever possible. It gives a job developer one more negotiating point with an employer who is reluctant to hire a refugee. This is especially important, according to Squeri, since there has been a switch recently from a social services approach to a marketing approach in employment services. "The idea now is to show employers how hiring a refugee helps the employer and saves money, not to tell them to give someone a break." TJTC works well for 18 to 24-year-old refugees, Squeri said, perhaps enabling them to get a first job. "The problem is that very few of the refugees fit that category."

Information on TJTC is available from state job or employment service offices.

**Resources**

**CHURCH STUDY GUIDES AVAILABLE**

"No Longer a Stranger" is a set of four short study guides designed for local church groups to use in learning about immigration and refugee issues.

Produced by the United Board for Homeland Ministries in 1983 for use by United Church of Christ congregations or clergy, the booklets include: **Who Are They, Problems and Concerns, Legislation and Policy, and Opportunities for Ministry**.

The materials are intended to introduce immigration and refugee issues primarily to adults, but the materials are suitable for youths. Each booklet includes an explanation of the issue, suggestions for study and use of resources, and a listing of print, audio-visual, and organizational resources.

The study guides are available in English or Spanish for $3.50 each, or $35.00 for 12 copies. Send requests with fee to the Immigration Task Force, United Church Board for Homeland Ministries, 132 West 31st Street, NY, NY 10001. Tel. (202) 239-8700.

**STUDY OF MEXICAN IMMIGRATION EFFECTS**

Most recent immigrants to southern California are undocumented, and half of all recent immigrants in California have settled in Los Angeles County. The presence of Mexican immigrants in southern California did not cause unemployment to rise among non-Hispanic minorities, particularly Blacks.

These are some findings of **The Fourth Wave: California's Newest Immigrants, a Summary**, an Urban Institute study by Thomas Muller to be released in late 1984. It explores the social and economic issues associated with documented and undocumented immigrants to California, focusing on the impact of recent Mexican immigration.

The summary is available for $3 from Urban Institute Press, P.O. Box 19958, Hampden Station, Baltimore, MD 21211. The book will be available this winter. To order, send $12.95 (paperback) or $19.95 (hardcover) plus $2 shipping charge.

**PAPER ON ASYLUM PROCESS IN NEW YORK**

Applying for Political Asylum in New York: Law, Policy and Administrative Practice, by Patricia Weiss Fagen for the New York Research Program in Inter-American Affairs, describes New York institutions, legal precedents and community organizations that play essential roles in the asylum process. The 66-page paper, published in April 1984, also presents case studies on Salvadorans and Haitians in New York, and takes a look at the asylum decision-making process. Send requests (with $2.60 to cover costs) to New York University Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 19 University Place, Room 310, New York, NY 10003. (212) 598-3395.

**Statistics**

**CORRECTION:** There is an error in the totals listed in the first table in Vol. V, No. 13/14, Indochinese Refugees by Ethnic Group Camp Populations as of 6/30/84. The correct grand totals are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Lao Highland Khmer Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lao Highland</td>
<td>22,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>52,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>53,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>YTD FY 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>15348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAI</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDADO</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>MALAWI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>MACAO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGOLA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MOZAMBIQUE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURMA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>BORN ON BOARD/SEA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>PAKISTAN</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>PAKKANGUY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PANAMA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>2611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>3092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>SOMALIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY (DEM. REP.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GERMANY (FED. REP.) | 43 | SW AFRICA (HAMBIA) | 6 | 9
| GHANA         | 1          | SPAIN        | 7          |
| GREECE        | 10         | SUDAN        | 117        |
| HONG KONG     | 99         | STRIA        | 7          |
| HUNGARY       | 399        | TAIWAN       | 2          |
| INDONESIA     | 108        | TANZANIA     | 1          |
| IRAN          | 2049       | THAILAND     | 2776       |
| IRAQ          | 114        | TURKEY       | 8          |
| ISRAEL        | 1          | UNITED KINGDOM (ENG) | 1 |
| ITALY         | 10         | USSR         | 538        |
| JAPAN         | 3          | VIETNAM      | 17116      |
| KAMPUCHEA     | 11402      | YUGOSLAVIA   | 16         |
| KENYA         | 2          | YEMEN (ADEN) | 1          |
| KUWAIT        | 1          | ZAIRE        | 35         |
| LAOS          | 4779       | ZAMBIA       | 9          |
| LEBANON       | 1          |              | 1          |
| LIBYA         | 1          | UNKNOWN      | 0          |
| LIECHTENSTEN | 2          | OTHER        | 12         |

TOTAL FOR JUNE 1984: 8597
TOTAL FOR YTD FY 84: 50049

* Information in this report is based on documents from ACVA. IOM and other federal agencies available on the date of this report and may not include information on all refugees in the categories reported.
* Note: Children born in refugee camps are assigned citizenship of parents. Citizenship information is often lacking, especially for non-Southeast Asians.

SOURCE: Office of Refugee Resettlement.
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EXCLUDABLE MARIEL CUBANS MAY BE RETURNED TO CUBA

Negotiations underway between the U.S. and Cuba to return Cuban "undesirables" here in exchange for political prisoners and would-be immigrants have raised the concern of agency officials working with the population. Recent press reports suggest high level discussions on the exchange, but the number and which persons would be affected are yet unclear.

Initially it was reported that the U.S. wanted to return 2,700 convicted criminals and severely mentally ill Cubans in exchange for up to 15,000 family reunification cases and 1,500 former political prisoners approved for entry to the U.S. However, the September 24 issue of U.S. News and World Report stated that the number had been lowered to 500.

Those who were incarcerated shortly after their arrival in the U.S. because they admitted to having committed crimes in Cuba and others jailed since entering the U.S. for crimes committed here may be part of the exchanged population. Still others released from federal detention into mental health programs may also be part of a negotiated return.

Who Would Be Returned Subject of Concern The American Council for Nationalities Service (ACNS) and other agencies working with Mariel Cubans have raised several issues about the exchange to U.S. government officials. They note discrepancies between the number of persons originally discussed as returnable by the U.S. government--2700--and those they estimate to be hardened criminals in U.S. prisons--a much lesser number. They also question whether deportation to Cuba and an uncertain fate is justifiable punishment for the crimes committed. Among interested groups there is some disagreement as to whether hardened criminals in the federal penitentiary in Atlanta should be returned. Some are concerned that the Cubans will be treated harshly and unfairly upon their return to Cuba--perhaps imprisoned for prolonged periods or shunned and discriminated against in finding work and housing.

But universally, the groups express concern for those with marginal backgrounds or questionable convictions, as well as those with established ties such
as wives and children in the U.S. Since some observers fear that there could be a round-up with little regard for the consequences, these groups are urging careful identification and review, on a case-by-case basis, of those who might be returned.

Who is Considered Eligible for Deportation? Persons attempting to enter the U.S. illegally are classified as "excludable" and eligible for deportation. Once admitted to the U.S. at a port of entry, a person is no longer considered excludable unless he or she is found to fall within certain categories, such as having committed a serious crime, insane, etc.

In May 1983, the State Department announced that Cubans affected by a return or exchange would be those presently in, or notified of, an exclusion proceeding; under final order of exclusion; detained under U.S. immigration laws; serving sentences in state or local jails for conviction of a felony or serious misdemeanor; or those suffering serious mental disorders and paroled to a mental health placement program sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service.

According to INS Community Relations Service (CRS), the Atlanta federal penitentiary now holds about 1,425 Cubans, 300 of whom admitted to having come directly from Cuban prisons. Just over 1,000 of those currently in the Atlanta facility had lived in the community but had been convicted of felonies or serious misdemeanors and returned under federal jurisdiction to Atlanta.

A yet unknown number of Mariel Cubans are currently held in state and local prisons for crimes committed under state law.

Around 250 persons who had been detained in Atlanta are currently in Public Health Service programs. Of these, those considered to have chronic mental health or psychiatric problems may also be affected by an exchange.

Mariel Boatlift Brought 125,000 Cubans
On April 1, 1980, a bus filled with Cuban army officers crashed through the gates of the Peruvian embassy in Havana. In what was described as an unpromeditated act, the group subsequently requested asylum. On April 4, Castro withdrew the guard around the embassy. By the next day, 10,000 people had stormed the embassy, and thus began a flood of asylum seekers that led to a massive evacuation to the U.S.

Then-President Carter accepted for entry to the U.S. these "freedom-seeking" Cubans. Between April and October 1980, 125,000 people left the shores of Cuba for the U.S. on what came to be known as the Freedom Flotilla.

The Marielitos, as they came to be known, were not given permanent legal status as asylum seekers, but were granted a newly-devised status of "special entrant" and made eligible for assistance under the Refugee Act. Haitian asylum seekers were also added into the special entrant category. Compared to earlier Cuban immigrants, the Mariel Cubans tended to be younger, less educated and less skilled, largely male, and of limited English-speaking ability.

The vast majority of the 125,000 who came in 1980 have adapted very well, many settling in existing communities in Miami and West New York, New Jersey. Some communities reacted negatively to the huge influx of Cubans, however, and a small number of Mariel Cubans committed serious crimes after their arrival in the U.S., according to one source who has worked extensively with Mariel Cubans. This "gave a bad name to the whole group," and Marielitos in general came to be characterized as social undesirables. In reality, less than 2 percent of those who came on the boatlift have posed legal and practical problems.

A Number with Criminal Backgrounds Put on Mariel Boats U.S. immigration officials discovered midway through the 1980 boatlift that male prison inmates were being loaded onto the boats leaving the Mariel port in Havana. Inundated with the immediate tasks of handling over a hundred thousand arrivals at the ports, it was not until later that authorities were able to piece the picture together.

Cuban prison inmates reported that they had been approached by prison officials and offered a choice either to leave the prison and go to the U.S. or to have an extension, such as two years, added onto their term. Those agreeing to leave the country were brought to the port, and a few from each category of common criminals, political prisoners, and ex-political prisoners were loaded onto each boat along with other emigrees. They were told to say they came
from the Peruvian embassy, lest they be rejected at the U.S. port.

Midway through the boatlift, in the summer of 1980, U.S. officials began to screen arriving Cubans. Those who admitted to prison records in Cuba were sent to the federal penitentiary in Atlanta, Georgia, administered by the Department of Justice's Bureau of Prisons. A total of 1,760 arrived at the Atlanta maximum security facility this way.

The population of persons incarcerated in Atlanta came to represent various strata of Cuban entrants, some guilty more of nuisance than criminal behavior. Those identified as troublemakers in camps set up for Cuban arrivals were also sent to Atlanta, as were those still in Ft. Chaffee not yet sponsored when the camp closed in early 1982. Over 1,000 persons released on parole from Atlanta and later convicted of felonies under federal law were returned to Atlanta.

What Happens to Those in Atlanta? The Attorney General Status Review Panel reviews inmates' cases once a year and determines which cases constitute a risk to the community-at-large. The panel reviews what the person is detained for, his behavior in detention, participation in penitentiary programs, and evidence submitted by the detainee himself. The panel's recommendations about which persons should be released are forwarded to the INS commissioner's representative, who makes the decision on releaseability. The person is then reviewed again, and is sent, if on conditional release, to the Public Health Service for mental/psychiatric treatment, or, if on unconditional release, to the Community Relations Service for placement.

PHS Treats Those Diagnosed as Mentally Ill Under contract to INS, the Public Health Service (PHS) of the Department of Health and Human Services evaluates Cubans incarcerated in Atlanta and treats those found to be releasable to community mental health programs under conditional parole from INS.

Barbara Lawson, who directed Fort Chaffee operations for HHS, now oversees PHS placements.

Lawson explained that those assigned to PHS are first sent to St. Elizabeth's hospital in Washington, D.C., a board and care mental health center. Program participants are then evaluated and those found to have potential to live independently are assigned to one of seven community programs around the country for behavioral treatment, according to which best serves their needs. They remain in the program until a transition can be made to self-sufficient living in the community.

Over 400 Mariel Cubans have been placed in the PHS program since it began operation in 1981. Currently, there are 273 participants throughout the country.

Graduates from the program number 24, but Lawson explained that this figure does not reflect all who have been helped and moved into independent living. A number have "walked away" from the program and are self-sufficient, though maybe not by conventional standards. Lawson said that other program participants have been transferred to other programs, have died, or have violated the terms of their parole and been returned to the Atlanta penitentiary.

Mariel Cubans Resettled Through Community Programs About 250 Mariel Cubans deemed eligible for unconditional parole have been released from Atlanta via the Community Relations Service to community programs. CRS looks for placements that emphasize acculturation, job development, and English language training.

Though several refugee resettlement agencies have also assisted many Mariel Cubans to adapt through conventional resettlement mechanisms, those released on parole through the CRS program have special requirements.

Some go to a correctional halfway house or a program specifically designed to assist Cubans. Others are sponsored by U.S. Catholic Conference or ACNS special resettlement programs in residential facilities that offer greater support than individual sponsors generally can. Cubans thus released are not eligible for public cash assistance for six months after release.

Frank Sharry in the ACNS affiliate in San Francisco, who has worked with Mariel Cubans since 1980, suggested that ACNS has found the paroled Cubans in their programs tend to have great difficulty in accepting responsibility needed to live independently. This may be due in part to prolonged incarceration, which may exacerbate socially unacceptable behavior patterns. To meet their
needs, ACNS structures its program to provide intensive and comprehensive care in the first few months of release. This includes residential or group living with round-the-clock support, ESL training, vocational counseling and job development.

Some Flounder After Community Placement
A good number of Cubans who have been released into the community, through whatever means, and have been on their own for some time have not succeeded in independent living. Discrimination in finding jobs or housing is a great obstacle for Cubans, many of whom are Black or Mulatto and few of whom speak fluent English.

The West New York, New Jersey and New York City areas have become home to the second largest community of Cubans in the U.S.—both from the Mariel boatlift and previous immigrants. As just one group trying to survive, Cubans must compete with thousands for public services.

Given the great needs of Cubans and Haitian entrants released into such an impacted area as New York City, the Office for Refugee Resettlement (ORR) two years ago made available targeted assistance funds to support community programs to shelter and aid Cubans and Haitians entrants.

New York Shelter Becomes Doorway into Successful Community Living
"The city put out a call and we responded with a proposal to provide two small shelters for Cubans and Haitians," Jack Doyle, director of the Bronx Red Cross, said. "And we got city backing for the proposals." With a $400,000 one-time Targeted Assistance grant beginning one year ago, the Bronx Red Cross opened two shelters, one for Cubans and one for Haitians.

A boarding house was found in the Bronx to house the Cubans. Though the house could hold only 12 persons, they moved in and developed a program to arrange ESL training, job assessment and training, and referral to medical providers.

Cubans referred to the shelter by local service providers were men ranging in age from 19 to 60 years. "Most had been incarcerated in the U.S.," commented Doyle, "some as many as two or three times." Four case-workers and a shelter monitor who staffed the house were bilingual, with varied experience working with Cubans, ex-offenders, group homes, and job development.

"Our approach is to deal with the whole person, how to relate to other people, to communicate in English, to learn how to find job possibilities, and so on, in the same place," Doyle explained. "For a program that the state expected just to provide a warm place to sleep and three meals a day, everything else we accomplished was pure gain."

Program Required and Taught Responsibility
The program placed a heavy emphasis on independent living skills. According to Doyle, residents were expected to clean the house, prepare meals, and actively participate in learning English, personal care, and community skills, such as how to use a bank and budget. "As people progressed with the basics, we could come up with a further plan for them to live on their own independently," Doyle said. Some would move into their own apartments, often shared, with the assistance and follow-up from the shelter staff to maintain jobs and constructive community activities.

Others were not ready to go out to the street, so the program leased three apartments to provide a smoother transition and more contact and support with program advocates. Sometimes problems were encountered that the program staff mediated, such as dealing with upset neighbors.

The program received substantial support from the community—many goods and services needed for day-to-day operations were donated by local businesses. This, added to thriftiness, meant the program underspent its budget.

In spite of the Bronx program's success in assisting Mariel Cubans who technically had graduated to the community but in reality lacked the skills to survive and make it, the Bronx program began to close the shelter this month. No extension of funds was allowable under ORR regulations, and the Red Cross program will lose its one-time funding. With limited funds available through January 1985, the Bronx Red Cross plans to retain the caseworkers on its staff to continue follow-up work with Cubans who have been in their program.

Doyle said that many local community agencies will increase their program load in order to try to meet the needs of those who were previously referred to the Bronx.
program shelter. But he fears that many will, once again, fall through the cracks and not necessarily be noticed except in cases where extreme measures are resorted to, their parole is revoked and they are returned to Atlanta.

Recent Developments

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES SPECIAL INITIATIVES ON AMERASIANS AND REEDUCATION CAMP PRISONERS, SMALL REDUCTION IN REFUGEE ADMISSIONS

The Reagan administration has proposed a worldwide refugee admissions ceiling of 70,000 for FY 85. Included within the proposed regional ceiling of 50,000 for East Asia is a distinct ceiling for admissions under the Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam. The administration proposal also includes initiatives to accept Asian-American children and reeducation camp prisoners from Vietnam.

The Judiciary Committees of both houses of Congress have agreed to the administration proposal in letters to the State Department. The content of these letters was not available, but government sources reported that the Senate Judiciary Committee letter included a specific endorsement of the initiatives on Amerasians and reeducation camp prisoners.

The president's formal determination was expected to be published in the Federal Register in the first week of October. As FY 85 began Monday, October 1, this would allow refugee processing to continue with virtually no gap for the first time in several years.

Southeast Asian Ceiling Remains Same The FY 85 overall ceiling of 70,000, while down only slightly from last year's ceiling of 72,000, continues the trend of recent years toward lower admissions.

The total ceiling for Southeast Asia will remain at the original FY 84 level of 50,000, but this will include a separate ceiling of 10,000 for the ODP program. In his statements to both house's Judiciary Committees on September 11, Secretary of State George Schultz said, "We believe that admission of 40,000 [non-ODP] refugees in FY 85 is our fair share--a level equal to the number of refugees we expect will be admitted by the rest of the refugee resettlement countries combined."

Schultz estimated that, with the proposed level of admissions, the total refugee population in Southeast Asian first asylum camps would drop to 116,000 by the end of FY 85, compared to 176,000 at the beginning of FY 84. He added that admission of 40,000 refugees "should encourage other resettlement nations to continue to participate in resettlement from Southeast Asia."

Refugees already accepted for admission to the U.S. but still in Refugee Processing Centers (RPCs) at the end of FY 84 will be admitted to the U.S. under FY 85 admissions ceilings. The State Department estimates that there will be approximately 21,250 refugees in RPCs at the end of FY 84. That will include approximately 2,400 ODP cases.

U.S. to Include Amerasians and Reeducation Camp Prisoners in ODP The administration's proposal of a separate ODP ceiling is designed to "ensure that a growing ODP is not perceived as reducing the number of refugees admitted to the U.S. from first asylum countries." The separate ceiling guarantees that, even if ODP grows beyond the proposed 10,000, the 40,000 allowable admissions from first asylum countries would not be reduced.

The administration estimates that the ODP ceiling of 10,000 would permit approximately 18,000 to leave Vietnam in FY 85 as refugees and immigrants. The number would probably include some 7,000 refugees to enter the U.S. in FY 86 after completing English language training and cultural orientation at the RPC in the Philippines.

According to Schultz, ODP has become an increasingly effective alternative to boat escapes from Vietnam. FY 84 ODP departures to all countries will exceed boat arrivals in countries of asylum for the first time since the program began. ODP departures for the U.S. surpassed 1,000 per month, and total departures to all countries have reached an average of 2,200 per month, Schultz added.

New Initiatives Under ODP Schultz said the administration is proposing to divide ODP into three separate sub-programs. In addition to the regular program for spouses
and children of American citizens, ex-U.S. government employees and ethnic minorities of special humanitarian concern, two other categories would be specified. One is for Asian-American children and their close family members and the other for current and former reeducation camp prisoners and qualified family members.

Under the first initiative, "the U.S. will accept for admission all Asian-American children and their qualifying family members presently in Vietnam--hopefully over the next three years." Estimates of the number of Amerasian children in Vietnam range from 8,000 to 15,000 (see *Refugee Reports*, Vol. V, No. 15/16).

The Vietnamese have previously disapproved of the U.S. treating Amerasian children as refugees rather than as immigrants.

The goal of the second initiative is the departure from Vietnam for resettlement in the U.S. of 10,000 current and former prisoners of reeducation camps and their qualifying family members.

Spokesmen of the Vietnamese government have said they would be willing to release all of these prisoners for resettlement. According to Schultz, two years of effort to arrange for their departure under ODP have resulted in Vietnam's release of "only a handful of these persecuted people for resettlement."

Vietnam has indicated that there are 7-8,000 prisoners still in reeducation camps. State Department sources suggested that, at one time, there may have been a maximum of 20,000 prisoners specifically associated with the former U.S.-backed government.

**Figures Lead to Confusion** At Senate Judiciary Committee hearings, Sen. Alan Simpson asked Schultz to clarify to whom the ODP ceiling of 10,000 applied and whether the State Department anticipated requesting additional refugee admissions numbers during FY 85 if negotiations on the new initiatives were successful. Schultz said that they did not anticipate needing to request more numbers, but added that it was impossible to know how many might depart Vietnam as a result of the initiatives.

Observers also expressed confusion as to how the numbers mentioned for Amerasians and prisoners could be reconciled with the ODP ceiling because Schultz's statement includes the initiatives in ODP but refers to them as being "in addition" to the FY 85 ceilings.

However, State Department sources made it clear that the initiatives are separate and that Schultz's language reflected a recognition of the need to use all available means to bring the reeducation camp prisoners and Amerasians out of Vietnam. Some may come out as refugees within FY 85 ceilings, some as immigrants, some in FY 86.

Both Judiciary Committees expressed their willingness to consult with the administration during the fiscal year if more numbers are needed for Amerasian children and reeducation camp prisoners.

**Negotiations Expected** The administration does not know how soon people will start to come out of Vietnam as a result of these initiatives. Schultz said, "Success in both of these initiatives will require the goodwill and cooperation of the Vietnamese government."

That is expected to be tested very soon. In response to questioning by Simpson, Robert Funseth, a deputy assistant secretary in the Bureau for Refugee Programs, said the U.S. will propose the two initiatives to Vietnam during an anticipated meeting on ODP under UNHCR auspices in Geneva early this month.

According to the Vietnam News Agency, a spokesman for the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry responded to reports of the anticipated meeting by emphasizing that Vietnam does not consider the people in reeducation camps political prisoners since they have committed "many crimes against our people." He said they can stay in reeducation camps because of the Vietnamese government's "leniency and humanitarian policy." State Department sources insist prisoners are in reeducation camps because of their association with the pre-1975 government or U.S. programs.

The Vietnamese spokesman added that the problem of people in reeducation camps is not related to the ODP conference to be held in Geneva. He concluded, "Vietnam is ready to hold talks with the United States on issues of mutual concern. Both sides should agree on the holding of these talks."

In regard to the Vietnamese statement that the Geneva meeting was not the place to discuss reeducation camp prisoners, a State Department spokesman said at a press
briefing, "Let's see how it develops."

**Ceilings for Other Regions Proposed**

Schultz announced that the administration's other proposed regional admissions ceilings are: 9,000 for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; 5,000 for the Near East and South Asia; 3,000 for Africa; 3,000 for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Schultz attributed the reduction in the ceiling for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to "the severe Soviet restriction on Jewish and other emigration..." A FY 85 ceiling of 9,000, Schultz said, should be high enough to provide for our fair share of the normal outflow of refugees from the countries of Eastern Europe.

According to Schultz, "The generous hospitality of African countries of first asylum and some limited possibilities for voluntary repatriation have mitigated the need for any significant resettlement outside of Africa." For the small number for whom asylum or integration in the region is not feasible, a ceiling of 3,000 is proposed.

The administration's proposed ceiling of 3,000 for Latin America and the Caribbean represents an increase of 2,000 over FY 84. Schultz said this level should be adequate to permit the admission of refugees for whom resettlement in the United States is the most appropriate option.

**Proposals Criticized**

Dale de Haan, chairman of the Committee on Migration and Refugee Affairs of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, complimented the administration's initiatives, but criticized its "calloused approach" to meeting the world's refugee resettlement needs. He called upon Congress to "restore the leadership the administration has abrogated in the refugee field," reducing admissions "at a time of tremendous refugee need around the world."

Voluntary agencies issued a set of private sector recommendations to the Judiciary Committees. They recommended a FY 85 overall ceiling of 79,500, excluding ODP, which the agencies said should not be subject to a quota.

Voluntary agency officials also suggested that the administration's proposals overlooked certain parts of the world, pointing to the low ceilings for Latin America and Africa.

**Officials Emphasize Domestic Resettlement**

In statements to the Judiciary Committees, Eugene Douglas, U.S. coordinator for refugee affairs, and Phillip Hawkes, director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), emphasized domestic resettlement concerns.

Douglas expressed disappointment that the administration had not been able to propose a ceiling closer to 50,000, but said that had been impossible given the world refugee situation and U.S. responsibilities. He said he expected an admissions ceiling of 50,000 during the next four years.

Douglas' remarks focused on improvements he said were needed in the domestic resettlement program. He announced that a working group will review several aspects of the reception and placement grants for consideration this winter by the Senior Interagency Group for Refugee Policy, as part of a continuing effort to improve voluntary agency accountability and to resolve differences in public and private resettlement program objectives.

According to Douglas, differences in federal and state government philosophies of their roles in resettlement have contributed to the mixed effectiveness of state-managed refugee programs. He was specifically concerned that the cooperative agreements with voluntary agencies give an appearance of broad responsibility that, due to states' control of most federal money for refugee programs, the voluntary agencies have little ability to fulfill.

"The administration believes that a higher priority for resettlement agencies should be to rejuvenate private sponsorship and expand contacts with the business sector instead of engaging in a contest for federal funds to maintain private social service bureaucracies," Douglas said. Private sponsors, who are not themselves recent refugees, are virtually ignored by states and voluntary agencies, making "our private refugee system...merely another welfare bureaucracy in which the crucial role of individual support and assistance is lost."

He said the administration supports efforts to encourage state governments to contract with refugee organizations to provide services, in order to build their capacity and because they are cost-effective service providers.

In urging passage of the Refugee Act reauthorization, Douglas emphasized the
administration's support of the intent of the Lungren amendment as a way to break the welfare cycle for refugees. He said the Fish amendment, which would provide for demonstration projects of alternatives to public cash and medical assistance programs, is an important part of the administration's strategy to increase the private sector role in resettlement.

**ORR Director Urges Reauthorization**

ORR Director Hawkes also discussed the importance of the reauthorization bill in dealing with what has become "the single most important indicator of the overall success of the refugee program--the national welfare dependency rate for refugees on cash or medical assistance."

Hawkes said recent efforts to enable refugees to become self-sufficient have been effective as the dependency rate for refugees who have been in the U.S. less than three years has dropped from 67 percent in 1981 to 53 percent in March 1984. He pointed out that the national dependency rate is skewed by the extraordinary dependency rate in California--89 percent. Hawkes said the proposed California cash and medical assistance demonstration project (see Refugee Reports, Vol. V, No. 13/14) is designed to address the central problem--the fact that California's AFDC grant level is 65 percent higher than the national average. But, Hawkes said, the project is contingent upon reauthorization of the Refugee Act with the Fish amendment, which is critical to the project's implementation.

Cost reductions in the resettlement program are projected, Hawkes suggested, as the three-year population eligible for assistance will decline from 318,000 as of October 1, 1983, to 228,000 this October 1, the start of FY 85.

Hawkes said that an evaluation of targeted assistance is currently underway to help identify programs that have been most effective in addressing refugee unemployment and dependency in major resettlement areas. In response to questioning from Sen. Simpson, Hawkes said he wants to study the effectiveness of targeted assistance before requesting more money for the program.

Hawkes also announced that ORR is summarizing "valuable program recommendations" that were made by people involved in resettlement at four regional consultation meetings held in Atlanta, Denver, Philadelphia, and San Francisco during FY 84. Those recommendations and ORR's responses are being incorporated in a document for distribution to the more than 800 participants in the meetings, including the refugee network.

**INS Commissioner Reports Improvements**

Alan Nelson, commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), reported that 81,000 refugee interviews were conducted during the first 10 months of FY 84. As a result, he said, 71,000 refugees will have been admitted to the U.S. during FY 84.

INS measures to improve management of overseas and refugee operations have helped improve refugee processing, according to Nelson. The measures include eliminating temporary duty officers and staffing overseas posts with INS officers for two-year tours; required language, area studies and related training for all overseas personnel (see Refugee Reports, Vol. IV, No. 18); and a regular rotation policy for overseas personnel that sets a maximum of five years for overseas tours.

Other changes which Nelson credited with improving INS work include moving the district office from Hong Kong to Bangkok; assigning a full-time officer to the ODP program in Bangkok; and continued improvements in interviewing techniques, country information, and field supervision.

Nelson reported that INS has made "noteworthy progress" in eliminating the asylum case backlog. The backlog, not including Cuban and Haitian applicants, was down from 46,349 at the beginning of FY 84 to 18,960 at the end of July. Nelson expressed the hope that a further reduction of at least 10,000 would be achieved by the end of FY 84. Nelson said he assumed that pending legislation, the Simpson-Mazzoli Immigration Reform Act, would deal with the 140,000 Cuban and Haitian applicants. Simpson remarked that special legislation would be needed if the Simpson-Mazzoli Immigration Reform Act is not passed (See Updates).

**TEXAS GULF COAST CALM--NEW FILM DEPICTS CONFLICT BETWEEN VIETNAMESE AND TEXAN SHRIMPERS**

In Emery Waite's boat basin in Seabrook, Texas, Vietnamese and American shrimpers...
unload side by side, a sign of the current calm. Tension between American and Vietnamese shrimp fishermen along the Texas Gulf Coast culminated in a June 1982 court order barring Ku Klux Klan harassment of the Vietnamese community. Recently, although resentment of increasing Vietnamese shrimping activity continues, there has been no trouble in the small fishing towns from Galveston Bay to Corpus Christi.

Officials and members of local communities credit federal and state agencies, in particular the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, and local councils which brought together Vietnamese and American fishermen and local officials with helping to calm the troubled situation.

This spring, there were concerns that trouble might be stirred up again as a motion picture involving the conflict between the Vietnamese and American fishermen was filmed in Rockport, one of the Gulf Coast towns. The cast included 200 Vietnamese and Americans from local communities. But the recent calm prevailed.

Declining Shrimp Business Tension between new Vietnamese residents and locals long involved in shrimping was brought about by growing numbers of Vietnamese operating fishing boats at a time when the Gulf Coast industry was suffering a long decline (see Refugee Reports, Vol. II, No. 23; Vol. III, No. 17). Resentment peaked after a Vietnamese refugee was accused of killing a Texas fisherman in Seadrift in August 1979.

Secondary migration brought more Vietnamese with fishing background to the Gulf Coast at a time when environmental factors, rising fuel costs, and competition from Mexican shrimpers were severely straining the Gulf Coast shrimping industry.

American fishermen accused the Vietnamese of violating shrimping limits and other regulations, and were suspicious of the ability of the Vietnamese to buy boats and equipment with cash. Vietnamese leaders acknowledged some violations of regulations because of language and cultural differences and their lack of familiarity with U.S. fishing laws.

Situation Attracted Filmmaker's Attention The conflict aroused the interest of French filmmaker Louis Malle, according to Ross Milloy. Malle read Milloy's 1980 New York Times Sunday Magazine article on the Vietnamese fishermen. He contacted Milloy and they began developing a script. Malle is best known in the U.S. as the director of Pretty Baby, Atlantic City, and My Dinner with Andre.

The film, Alamo Bay, is a love story, set in a small Texas fishing town, Milloy said. A young Vietnamese refugee arrives and becomes involved in the conflict between the Vietnamese and American fishermen.

The Vietnamese in the coast towns were hesitant to become involved in the film at first, said Milloy, executive producer of the film. They were worried that it would stir up old troubles and were distrustful of the media in general. The local American community had economic problems that they attributed to the Vietnamese. "So it was a
fragile political situation," Milloy said. But both communities cooperated, filming in Texas was finished in May, and production is being completed now. **Alamo Bay** is expected to be released in February.

**Vietnamese Man Plays Leading Role** Most of the cast members were recruited from the Gulf Coast towns. But the lead roles are played by American actors Ed Harris and Amy Madigan and by Ho Nguyen, a Vietnamese researcher from Houston with no previous acting experience.

Ho was 16 when he left Vietnam with his family in 1975, a day before the fall of Saigon. They lived in Nashville, Arkansas, where Ho graduated from high school. Since then, he has received bachelor's and master's degrees in biology. He now works at the University of Houston-Clear Lake, doing research on DNA and protein.

Ho read about the film in a Houston Vietnamese-language newspaper, wrote to ask for a part, and had several auditions. His only previous acting experience was in high school plays in Vietnam. While working as an interviewer and translator for a study of Vietnamese refugee adaptation, he had talked to several Vietnamese fishermen about their problems and became interested in them.

"By being in the film, maybe I can help some people understand my country people better," Ho said. He added that he had talked to Malle and to screenwriter Alice Arlen about the script before he agreed to be in the film, and he thought the story was very fair.

For Ho, **Alamo Bay** is more than a love story. "To me, the movie is a conflict between each individual. Nobody is bad in the whole story," he said. But he added, "Maybe the government was bad because they wouldn't give a loan to the American fisherman."

Ho said he would like to do some more acting but his dream is to be a doctor. His acting allowed him to save some money for medical school. Although his nose was broken in a fight scene and required surgery, Ho felt it was worth it. Laughing, he said, "I'm the first Vietnamese to play a leading role in an American movie. I hope that will be good for my community."

**Film Awaited by World's Vietnamese** The only other Vietnamese actor brought in from outside the Gulf Coast area was Le Van Khoa who plays the part of a Vietnamese priest. In Vietnam, according to Ho Nguyen, Khoa had been a famous composer, photographer, and television star, "the Vietnamese Mr. Rogers."

Khoa said that he had produced and hosted a variety of television programs for ten years in Vietnam. He came to the U.S. after the fall of Saigon in 1975. Now, he lives near Los Angeles and works as a printer. He continues to compose and give lectures on art, photography, and Vietnamese culture, and is having a major photography exhibit in Boston next spring.

Khoa said that Vietnamese people all over the world are eagerly awaiting **Alamo Bay**. Vietnamese newspapers in Europe, Australia, and the U.S. have printed articles about the film. "I think they will like it," he said. "The story respects the fact of some violations by Vietnamese fishermen, but overall it will be good for them."

**Local Vietnamese in Film** Truyen Tran lives in Port Lavaca, north of Rockport on one of the coast bays. He came to the Gulf Coast in 1975 and bought his first shrimpboat a few years later. When Milloy asked if he would like to be in the film, Truyen was uncertain, but he read the script and thought it would make no trouble for the Vietnamese. "I think the movie's very good. It should be an education for people."

The character Truyen plays has a family, owns a boat, and has some trouble with the American fishermen. In real life, Truyen also has a family--five children--and owns his own boat. But he has no trouble with American fishermen. "Things are a whole lot better now. The American fishermen are very friendly," he said. The Vietnamese and Americans in the bay even help each other. "Once my brother's boat broke down and all the Vietnamese were busy. An American towed my brother in in the dark."

Only four or five Vietnamese families live in Port Lavaca, according to Truyen. His neighbors are all Americans, his children's friends are Americans, and they play together very well, he said.

**Success in School Contributes to Calm** Government officials and Texans in the gulf communities agree that the situation has settled down although problems remain.
Several factors have apparently contributed to today's calm.

Lee Russell, state refugee coordinator for Texas, said, "The children of the Vietnamese fishermen are doing extremely well in school. That has helped the general atmosphere." Efrain Martinez, of the Houston office of the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, agreed. "The Vietnamese are becoming an established minority there," he said. "The kids are going to school and doing well in Americanization." According to Mayor Leonard Lamont of Palacios, the town's school population is over 12 percent Vietnamese and the students are at the top of their classes.

Fishing Violations Corrected Emery Waite owns a wholesale-retail seafood business in Seabrook and was chairman of the local fishermen's council during the height of the troubles. He suggested recently that many of the initial problems were due to the Vietnamese fishermen's ignorance of the laws. "That's no longer a problem. They generally abide by them now." Translations of the fishing laws and seminars conducted by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department for the Vietnamese fishermen along the coast helped overcome the ignorance that led to some violations, Russell said.

Also, Waite said, most of the trouble a few years ago was caused by a few radicals who were urging the Klan, not by the general population. Most of the troublemakers have left, he said.

All of these officials agreed that the councils of American and Vietnamese fishermen formed in 1979 had helped resolve the tensions. Now, Waite said, the councils still exist but mostly on a standby basis in case they are needed again.

Shrimp Business Declining But the continuing decline of the shrimping business still troubles the American community. "The general populous doesn't feel much better today than six years ago about being put out of business," Waite said. "But they don't necessarily hold it against the Vietnamese."

Waite estimated that 80-85 percent of the 200 or so shrimping boats in the area are Vietnamese-owned now. Five or six years ago, he said, perhaps five of the 185 boats were Vietnamese-owned. "There will be underlying resentment for the rest of this generation," Waite went on. "The Americans can't compete, and they are getting out of the business. But time helps. They feel there's nothing you can do about it so you might as well get used to it."

Problems Still Need To Be Resolved Some local residents resent that Vietnamese have continued to move to the area, State Refugee Coordinator Russell said. Although there are no initial placements there, Vietnamese have continued to move to the area because extended family members come to join relatives along the coast. Russell added that most of the new arrivals are not getting involved in shrimping.

But the growing Vietnamese population in some of the towns has meant some continuing concerns. Mayor Lamont said people in Palacios are concerned because the Vietnamese are buying so much property in town. Paying prices as high as double or triple the assessed value, Vietnamese have been buying commercial and residential property. Some locals are concerned that the Vietnamese will own most of Palacios before long or, at least, that the nature of the community will drastically change.

Lamont suggested, though, that the communities were solving these newer problems just as they had the earlier shrimping conflicts. A year ago, Vietnamese living in a Palacios mobile home were accused of violating housing codes. They were adding on to the mobile homes, making them so close together that emergency vehicles could not get through, filling their yards with crab traps, chopping fish and butchering animals in their yards, and using waste water to irrigate their gardens.

The town worked with Martinez, the state coordinator's office, and ORR officials to have the housing codes translated. Meetings were held with Vietnamese leaders from the mobile home parks to discuss the violations. Lamont said they are beginning to comply. "We just have to keep reminding them about things that are different culturally from what they are used to."

Martinez said the Community Relations Service will soon conduct a survey of the communities along the coast with concentrations of Indochinese in order to see what issues are there. He has also recommended
that a position be created, to be filled by a Vietnamese, to monitor these communities and provide assistance in assessing and resolving problems.

Projects and Programs

IOWA REFUGEE PROGRAM PRODUCES INNOVATIONS IN JOB DEVELOPMENT AND LITERACY TRAINING

A videotape produced for use in the Iowa Refugee Service Center (IRSC) job development program and a refugee tutorial program adopted by the state for a general literacy program demonstrate, each in its own way, how the refugee resettlement program benefits society.

With a $3,000 grant from the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) Denver office and production assistance from the state communications agency, the Refugee Service Center produced the videotape, Why Employers Hire Southeast Asians. According to Mary Weidner, director of IRSC, the videotape was developed as a tool, a good, quick way to talk to potential employers and show them the advantages of hiring refugees.

Videotape, Brochure Appeal to Employers

A brochure highlighting the employers' positive comments is used to promote the tape. The brochure asks for ten minutes of the employer's time to watch the tape and "learn how to make your business more productive." For those who may not see the tape, the brochure itself conveys the essential message, said Richard Whitaker, information officer for IRSC.

IRSC's job developers try to make appointments with prospective employers to show the tape and make personal presentations. The tape serves as a vivid introduction to the possibility of hiring refugees, but Weidner stressed the importance of the job developer's presentation.

Although use of the tape has just begun this summer, it has already produced some job placements, according to Weidner.

In conjunction with the videotape, IRSC has begun an employer recognition award program. Job developers are presenting certificates signed by Weidner and Gov. Terry Branstad to over 50 employers who have hired Southeast Asians.

Aggressive Job Development Is Key

These new features are part of an overall job development program that Weidner said is the main reason why cash assistance usage is very low in Iowa. Only nine percent of Iowa's 8,700 refugees receive any cash or medical assistance. According to ORR's FY 1983 Report to Congress, only 2.1 percent were receiving Refugee Cash Assistance and 4.7 percent Aid to Families with Dependent Children as of September 1983.

Weidner said this high level of self-sufficiency has been achieved despite two or two and a half years of deep recession in Iowa. This success is due, he said, to the job development program which has made an average of 85 job placements per month since April 1982, when IRSC was reorganized to emphasize job development.

At the heart of the success is the close connection between job development and case management, Weidner said. "Our case managers are our job developers. The whole system is geared toward employment." That concentration and the tight linkages between IRSC staff, other state agencies, the voluntary agencies, and employers make the case management system effective, he added.

Another important feature is the follow-up services provided to employers. IRSC will translate employers' work rules into refugee languages, will do follow-up counseling and interpreting, and will even help the new refugee employee on the first day of work.

The center's job developers have used the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program extensively (see Refugee Reports, Vol. V, No. 15/16) and have found it to be a very effective incentive to hire certain refugees,
Weidner said.

**Staff Includes VISTA Volunteers** Weidner attributed much of the program's success to an effective staff of some 20 job developers, most of them bilingual. The staff includes five VISTA volunteers now, and six more are being added. Weidner said IRSC applied for VISTA slots specifically to do job development and they have been very effective. "We've found, if volunteers, particularly VISTAs, are trained and supervised and given the same expectations as staff, they'll perform much as a paid staff member does. Their productivity has exceeded our expectations many times."

Weidner cited, as an example, the recruitment of a Cuban woman as a VISTA to work with two private agencies that had had little success in helping the state's 50-60 Cuban entrants achieve self-sufficiency. Before the end of her VISTA year, all of the Cuban entrants were working. Weidner said, "For many it took several placements, but she kept with them until their situations stabilized."

Although three of the center's current VISTA volunteers are Khmer, Weidner said it is difficult to recruit refugees as VISTAs because the monthly stipend is not enough for them to support their families.

**Refugee Tutorial Project Expanded**

Weidner said that the recent adoption of Iowa's Refugee Volunteer Tutor Program model for statewide use in a new Iowa Literacy Program is an example of a significant benefit of the refugee program to the community as a whole.

The tutorial program began in 1979. Since then, Weidner said, about 1,000 volunteers have been trained to give English language tutoring to refugees. Run by IRSC with local community colleges, the program generated interest throughout the Iowa educational community, according to Weidner.

As a result, the Iowa Literacy Program was started this spring, based on the refugee program model and coordinated by the governor's office, the Department of Public Instruction, and IRSC. Over 100 volunteers have been recruited to give literacy training to anyone in Iowa.

Recently, the Department of Corrections became interested in the model because of the high concentration of illiteracy in correctional facilities. Literacy training with volunteer tutors will begin in two correctional facilities this fall. Some residents will be trained to be tutors for others. Weidner said that corrections officials viewed this program, a direct outgrowth of the refugee tutorial program, as having rehabilitation potential.

---

**Update**

- Two dozen national church and civil and legal rights organizations petitioned U.S. senators to pass the DeConcini Refugee Protection bill (S. 2131). The bill would temporarily suspend deportation of Salvadoran nationals in the U.S., pending presidential and congressional study and recommendations for their safe return. The joint communiqué, dated September 20, stated that the weekly return of 100 Salvadorans to "an uncertain fate [is] unconscionable" and that the groups are "deeply disturbed" about continuing strife and the high rate of casualties that has left 40,000 civilians dead in the past four years.

- U.S. District Court Judge Charles Ritchie upheld the Reagan administration's denial of extended voluntary departure status on humanitarian grounds for Salvadorans in the U.S. in a case brought by Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union Local 25 against the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of Justice, and the attorney general. In a 27-page opinion issued on September 26, Judge Ritchie said, "It is clear that aliens have no constitutional right to enter or remain in the United States." Nearly 5,000 were deported to El Salvador last year.

- Canada has accepted 500 additional refugees from Hong Kong over and above their regular Hong Kong quota. The additional refugees, selected from the two closed camps in Hong Kong, must arrive in Canada before December 15, 1984. Refugees and officials in Hong Kong expressed hopes that other countries will follow Canada's lead in resettling more from Hong Kong.

- The Simpson-Mazzoli Immigration Reform Act is apparently dead. Senate and House
conferees, meeting since September 13, had reached compromises on most of the key provisions of the bill, including "legalization" and "employer sanctions." But after three days of heated negotiations, conferees were unable to agree on an issue related to employer sanctions--whether and how to prevent employment discrimination against lawful permanent residents, legalized temporary residents, refugees, and asylees.

On September 26, House Judiciary Chairman Peter Rodino (D-N.J.) recessed the conference without setting a time to reconvene. With less than a week remaining in this session of Congress, elections approaching, recent opposition from more groups, and reports of dwindling House support for the bill in any of its forms, it appeared unlikely that a successful effort to revive the bill could be made this year.

The Senate has not acted on its version of the Refugee Act reauthorization. The short session between the Republican convention and the recess scheduled to begin October 5, apparently combined with House and Senate differences over the legislation, particularly the Lungren amendment, to doom reauthorization for this session of Congress. A continuing resolution to fund refugee and entrant programs for FY 85--which began October 1--passed the House on September 25. At press time, the Senate was still considering the continuing resolution.

Resources

BRITISH REFUGEE COUNCIL ISSUES REFUGEE REPORT 1984: AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY

The British Refugee Council, a London-based organization comprised of 25 member voluntary agencies, has recently published Refugee Report 1984, An International Survey. Edited by Jeff Crisp and Clive Nettleton, this comprehensive document reports on refugee situations throughout the world, and gives special attention to their treatment and settlement in Great Britain.

Half of the 68-page report is devoted to articles by various writers about issues confronting refugees in the United Kingdom, causes of refugee crises, and efforts to resolve them. This section includes analyses of historical and geo-political factors leading to refugee crises, focusing on Ethiopia, Vietnam, and Afghanistan, and stresses the need for awareness of the political nature of refugee situations.

The report presents several articles on refugees, asylees, and resettlement in the United Kingdom. Topics include legal procedures and status of refugees and asylum seekers in the U.K., health screening, training and education, and research on refugee experiences.

BRC's report gives an historical overview of asylum and refugee resettlement in Great Britain. Since the 1930s, 200,000 Poles and 50,000 other Eastern Europeans found refuge in Britain. And in the past 15 years, refugees have arrived through a special resettlement program, including 3,000 Chileans, 20,000 Iranians, 17,000 Indochinese, and 30,000 Ugandan Asians. Iran, Iraq, Ghana, and Poland nationals constitute the largest number of asylum seekers.

The second half of BRC's Refugee Report is devoted to statistical information and reference materials regarding refugees. This includes: a country-by-country guide to refugee movements and conditions; a survey of refugee populations worldwide; a world map of refugee populations; a bibliography of books and articles on refugees and displaced persons by region; and a directory of 31 British-based and international agencies assisting refugees.

To order Refugee Report 1984, write: Information Section, British Refugee Council, 3-9 Bondway, London SW8 1JL, U.K. The cost is £2.95 + £1.05 overseas handling. The agency requests that payment be sent in British currency. Orders for more than 5 copies receive a 15 percent discount.

ORR REPORT: "A STUDY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES"

An ORR report, "A Study of English Language Training for Refugees in the United States," summarizes findings from a three-phase study conducted by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon. The study investigated the language learning experience of recently arrived Southeast Asian refugees to determine what contributes to their successful English acquisition.
The study found 327 service providers receiving ORR funds who offered English language training (ELT) to adult refugees during FY 81 or FY 82. An estimated 149,890 refugees were enrolled in ORR-funded ELT during FY 82. ORR spent an estimated $29,201,062 for ELT in FY 82, 43 percent of its social services budget that year.

Individual background characteristics of refugees have a strong influence on refugees' English acquisition, the study found. Men, people under 50, and those with previous schooling are more likely to participate in ELT. Most refugees in the U.S. less than 12 months either work or take English. Few do both at the same time and very few do neither. The higher the level of previous education and the younger the adult refugee, the more quickly English is acquired and the higher the proficiency attained. ELT participation was found to contribute significantly to refugee's English acquisition, especially in helping very low level students achieve a survival level.

Staff Needs Assessed The study found that teachers and administrators expressed a need for staff development, particularly in new teaching approaches, students' cultural backgrounds, and instruction of non-literate learners. Much instruction assumes that students have literacy skills. The report suggested that specialization by proficiency level, particularly literacy, may help less literate students, for whom classes that depend on written material may be inappropriate. Most programs have access to appropriate books, but some are highly isolated from information on current materials. Many teachers said they need lower level materials for teaching literacy and higher level materials for vocationally specific English.

The study suggests that ELT is more conducive to English acquisition than is early placement in employment. To overcome barriers to participation in ELT, the study recommends special classes for nonliterals and arrangements for child care for students. Greater use of formal and informal channels was encouraged to make materials developed by different programs more widely available. The report urged teachers to consider the cultural and educational backgrounds of their students and, in particular, to assess the appropriate use of literacy in their classrooms.

The report is available from ORR, Rm. 1229, Switzer Bldg., 330 C St. SW, Washington, D.C. 20201. By the end of October, copies will be available from the Refugee Materials Center, 324 E. 11th Street, 9th Floor, Kansas City, Missouri 64104. Copies of the separate reports on each phase will be available from the Refugee Materials Center by mid-November.

SELF-RELAXATION EXERCISES

Self-relaxation exercises designed to help relieve the stress and anxiety refugees experience as they adapt to life in the U.S. are available from Linda Vista Health Care Center. The audio cassettes are in Vietnamese, Cambodian, Lao, and Hmong. To order, specify the language, and send $3.00 per tape to Jill Borg Spitzer, Linda Vista Health Care Center, 6973 Linda Vista Road, San Diego, CA 92111. Tel. (619) 279-0925.

NEW DISTRIBUTION SITE FOR ORR REPORTS

Published reports from the Office of Refugee Resettlement are now distributed by the Refugee Materials Center in Kansas City, Missouri. According to ORR, a limited supply of new reports will also still be available from the ORR Washington, D.C., office.

A catalogue of holdings is available from the distribution center. Orders can be sent to: Refugee Materials Center, U.S. Department of Education, 324 E. 11th Street, 9th floor, Kansas City, MO 64104, attn: Bud Tumy. (816) 374-2276.

CORRECTION: In the last issue, Vol. V, No. 15/16, the last sentence of the article, "Congress Tells ORR to Restore Social Services Allocation Level," should have read:

Social services allocations for FY 84 are based on the number of refugees in a state who have arrived in the U.S. in the last 36 months, reduced by factors to account for those refugees who do not actually participate in refugee social services.
## ASYLUM CASES FILED WITH DISTRICT DIRECTORS FOR FY 84 CUMULATIVE
As of August 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY*</th>
<th>Received This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Received This FY</th>
<th>Granted This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Granted This FY</th>
<th>Denied This FY</th>
<th>Cumulative Denied This FY</th>
<th>Pending End of Month</th>
<th>Cumulative Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22,833</td>
<td>7,529</td>
<td>27,864</td>
<td>143,874</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHAMAS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,652</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>3,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>121,765</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>11,866</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONDURAS</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nationalities with fewer than 10 applications pending are omitted from this chart
** Other than Hong Kong

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service
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VIOLENCE, DISCRIMINATION TOWARD SOUTHEAST ASIANS PROMPTS GROWING CONCERN

A September New York Times headline read, "Violence Forces Hmong to Leave Philadelphia." In the last year and a half, similar headlines have told of incidents of harassment and violence against Southeast Asian refugees in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New York, Texas, and California. Incidents like these have aroused the concern of law enforcement officials and refugee advocates. They have also prompted a variety of actions at national, state, and local levels.

Civil Rights Commission Studies Problem The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights decided in March to study "whether there is an upsurge in racial hostility directed toward Asian-Americans, particularly those who may be new immigrants." The commission is an independent, bipartisan, fact-finding agency of the executive branch. Its duties include investigating allegations of discrimination because of race or national origin.

The study was recommended by Commissioner John H. Bunzel, senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. Bunzel told Refugee Reports that the influx of Southeast Asian refugees in recent years created a situation of "ethnic enclaves" with a pattern of language difficulties, low income, and low educational and skill levels. "Refugees are caught in a struggle to survive," he said. Against this background, increased reports of harassment of Asians at work, taunting of students at school, beatings, vandalism, and shots fired into homes led him to urge the commission to consider these problems.

Bunzel said the study is a preliminary review to determine whether anti-Asian sentiment has surged in recent years, how serious the problems are, whether there are patterns of discrimination, and, if so, whether they are national or regional.

If the study reveals problems of a sufficient scale, he said, the commission would hold a full-scale review with hearings. That would lead to a report, including analysis and recommendations, to the legislative and executive branches. According to research staff at the commission, the preliminary study will take about a year.

IN THIS ISSUE:

- Recent Developments
  ORR policy affects financing of California services to facilitate access to health care; legal advocates and service providers question handling of Central American youths apprehended at U.S. border

- Projects and Programs
  Favorable Alternative Sites Project to continue, evaluation report issued

- Update

- Resources

- Statistics
  Southeast Asian refugees: estimated state populations through 8/31/84

Digitized from Best Copy Available
Racial Nature of Incidents Questioned
There is disagreement about whether anti-Asian sentiment is growing, according to Bunzel. Some observers feel that economic factors—plant closings, the shifting of industrial jobs to Asia, and unemployment blamed on foreign imports—and the influx of Southeast Asian refugees are producing a "new racism," a racism manifested not by discriminatory laws, but by private actions toward Asians. Others, Bunzel said, feel anti-Asian sentiment is not growing and that to talk of such growth is a distortion that could become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The impression of increasing violence against Southeast Asians is difficult to confirm statistically. In Boston, for instance, there has been an increase over the last few years, according to Chuck Wexler, a civilian in the Civilian Disorders Unit of the Boston Police Department. But he warned that comparisons between years or between different cities may be misleading since the reporting is so uneven. This is due, he said, to language difficulties and the bad experience refugees have had with police in their native lands, which carries over to a reluctance to report incidents now. "Those police departments that go out aggressively and talk to ESL classes and refugee groups get statistics that more accurately reflect the situation."

Bob Blitzer of the FBI's civil rights unit could not confirm that there was a marked increase in cases involving alleged abuses of Southeast Asians' civil rights. But minorities tend to be fairly close-mouthed, and new immigrants may be unaware of federal civil rights laws, he said. As a result, there may be incidents that no one ever hears about.

Massachusetts Addresses Racially Motivated Violence A wide variety of incidents of violence and harassment has been reported. Each situation has produced different interpretations and different responses.

In Massachusetts, Attorney General Francis X. Bellotti filed a complaint on September 21, charging a juvenile with violating the state's Civil Rights Act based on allegations that he had twice attacked Vietnamese residents of Dorchester because of their race or national origin. The attorney general obtained a temporary restraining order prohibiting the defendant from injuring or harassing his victim or others.

In announcing the complaint, Attorney General Bellotti said, "Racially motivated violence is a serious problem for Southeast Asian residents of our state. Often these individuals cannot even walk along the public streets without being physically attacked and threatened because of their race or national origin." Assistant Attorney General Diana Tanaka said that Southeast Asian crime victims around Boston have been told, "This is going to be like Dorchester. Everyone knows this refers to the July 1983 stabbing death of a Vietnamese man in Dorchester, she said, adding that many Southeast Asians have moved out of the area.

Refugees Don't Know Rights Because they have limited funds to resettle refugees, agencies have placed them where housing is inexpensive, Tanaka said—often bad neighborhoods where, particularly in Boston with its established neighborhoods, they are viewed as outsiders. "The refugees are demoralized and they don't know their rights, so they don't fight back," Tanaka said.

When asked how the situation is, Tanaka went on, Southeast Asians say, "It's o.k." But to followup questions like, "Have they stopped throwing rocks at you?" or "Have they stopped shouting obscenities at you?", they respond, "No." The situation is not getting better, Tanaka said. "The refugees are just getting used to it."

Youth in the poorer areas where many refugees live know the Southeast Asians are vulnerable and reluctant to report incidents of violence, Wexler said. "We've found that when the police get involved and start to make arrests, it changes the perception that there won't be any penalty for it, and incidents start to decrease."

The Attorney General's office recently issued bilingual pamphlets on civil rights in Vietnamese, Lao, and Cambodian. "Your Civil Rights Under Massachusetts Law" is being distributed through refugee organizations, the courts, police, and government offices in an effort to inform refugees how the law protects them from racially motivated violence and harassment and from discrimination in housing, employment, access to public accommodations, and use of force by police. It provides examples of violations and explains what to do if someone thinks his or her rights have been violated.
Tanaka said, "There is a need to make clear to refugees that having rocks thrown at you is not normal in the U.S."

Philadelphia Violence Brings Civil Rights Investigation  
Tension between Hmong and Blacks in the rough urban neighborhood of West Philadelphia have led many of the Hmong to move from Philadelphia recently. The severe beating of a Hmong man, the stoning of Hmong cars and apartments, the surrounding and threatening of a Hmong household by a group of local men, apartment windows hit by rifle bullets, muggings, and robberies have been reported.

Philadelphia's Hmong population has fallen from a high of approximately 5,000 to about 650 over the last few years, according to the New York Times. Six Hmong family groups left Philadelphia in a recent eight-day period. The Times said, "They were fleeing a wave of violence that left them afraid, they said, to walk the city's streets or even stay in their homes."

On September 7, U.S. Attorney Edward S.G. Dennis initiated a criminal civil rights investigation into the recent violence against the Hmong refugees in West Philadelphia. William Carr of the U.S. Attorney's office in Philadelphia said that Dennis had directed the FBI to determine if any of the incidents involved violations of federal civil rights laws. At the same time, Carr said, Dennis asked the Community Relations Service of the Justice Department to step up its activities to protect the Hmong from attacks.

Frank Tyler of the Community Relations Service has been meeting with Hmong leaders. He said, "It has been recognized for some time that resettling refugees in the most depressed areas, already full of problems, is a conflict-generating situation. Sometimes there may not have been time to identify the communities' receptivity, but it's important to talk to local leaders, church people, and others before resettlement."

Tyler also feels that any community where refugees are going to live needs to be better informed. "As refugees improve economically and move to the suburbs, we need to prepare the suburban communities for their arrival."

Edward V. Avery, who has worked with the Hmong in Philadelphia, said Black youths there with high unemployment rates have asked why immigrants, instead of long-time residents, received special federally funded employment aid. Tyler said the Black community in West Philadelphia was incensed about the resettlement of Southeast Asians there, particularly when Blacks were evicted from an apartment complex because it was "unfit for human habitation," and a few months later refugees moved in with no renovations done. Such perceptions contribute to feelings of resentment against the refugees.

Tyler said the police feel that the Hmong have begun reporting incidents that went unreported before. He said this indicates that the refugees have begun to overcome distrust of law enforcement officials that they carried from their home countries. "They are beginning to recognize that law enforcement agencies are there to help."

The Community Relations Service is trying to reach out to the police and the judicial system to inform them of refugees' needs, including interpreter services. Working with the police, the service has provided refugees with emergency cards in Hmong language to use to communicate with police.

Focusing on Common Neighborhood Concerns  
The Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations has also been active in trying to reduce tensions in West Philadelphia and other areas where Southeast Asians are concentrated. Thomas Morton, a human relations representative at the commission, said he has been working with community groups in three areas: improving the reporting of crimes and harassment; conflict prevention through education about refugees for long-time residents and for refugees about local matters like Philadelphia's block structure; and community development--focusing attention on the common concerns of everyone in the neighborhoods. For example, they are trying to develop Town Watch organizations and get Asian residents involved in them.

At the end of October, the commission held three hearings in the neighborhoods with Asian concentrations on "Concerns and Problems of Philadelphia's Asian Residents and Their Neighbors." Morton said the hearings were to allow people to testify about their experiences, what policies and
practices should be changed to improve relations, and what kind of programs community organizations could carry out with support from public agencies. A report will be presented to Mayor Wilson Goode.

**Violence Affects Non-Asians, Too**

Tyler said the entire West Philadelphia community, not just the Hmong, is plagued by violence. According to Morton, the Hmong have drawn the most attention for various reasons, but any resentment is toward all Asian newcomers. He is reluctant to say there is any systematic rash of violence against Asians. "There is a racial and ethnic factor, but it is one of many factors. Often it is not a factor, or not the deciding one."

He said a Black leader of the Logan Neighborhood Multi-Cultural Task Force spoke out after a Vietnamese and a Korean were beaten on the same night recently. She said she was not speaking for Asians against Blacks, but was against violence toward anyone, Blacks and Asians included, in the neighborhood. Morton said this kind of response is still unusual, but the commission's work is to make it more common.

**Dallas Incidents Not Seen as Racial**

Since the beating death of a Cambodian man in a Dallas housing development in 1983, the Dallas police have been meeting with refugees to hear their concerns and discuss what can be done about them. Charles Kemp of the Dallas-Fort Worth Refugee Interagency, Inc. said that about 4,000 of the 25-30,000 Southeast Asians settled in Dallas live in a tough East Dallas neighborhood. There has been violence, but, Kemp said, there have been few directly racial attacks on Asians. "It is not a Black-versus-refugee problem," he said. "There is a definite fear of young, angry Black men, but the Black community has the same fear."

For a while, the problem was placement of refugees in inappropriate apartments and areas, Kemp said. Agencies responded to the problems and stopped placing refugees in certain areas. The problem now, Kemp said, is newcomers living in isolated apartments. They are not placed in housing projects now, but some refugees move there to save money.

Kemp said that the people working on the problem--from the police to the refugee agencies--have, so far, been able to prevent major troubles instead of reacting to them.

The Refugee Interagency now gives training to each new police class and to veteran officers during regular in-service programs. The sessions on the cultural background of refugees and the story of their resettlement in Dallas have been well received, Kemp said. Southeast Asians have become more willing to report crimes, indicating that they have begun to develop trust for the appropriate authorities.

**Hmong Harassed in Green Bay**

Not all of the incidents against Southeast Asians are related to crowded, racially troubled urban areas. A bullet allegedly fired into the car of a Hmong refugee in Green Bay, Wisconsin, has fueled fear among the area's Hmong community of approximately 900. Peter McKeever, a lawyer for Legal Services of Northeastern Wisconsin, said the October 6 incident is the most serious of several against the Hmong. Others range from eggs thrown at houses to damage to automobiles. McKeever is also concerned about a pattern of landlords exploiting refugees' unfamiliarity with such things as utility meters in order to overcharge them.

The Hmong are perplexed, McKeever said. Their feeling is, "People yell at us, hassle us, and say we're lazy, don't work, and are on welfare. Then if we work, they say we take their jobs."

McKeever said that, on the whole, the incidents have been minor and that local racism toward Native Americans is probably worse. But he is concerned because the Hmong tend not to complain, fearing it will make things worse. He and local church groups have worked with the Hmong leadership to tell them that police are to help them, that reporting crimes is the way things are done in the U.S. The police department has designated an officer to work as a liaison with the Hmong community.

**Racial Reasons Cited in California Incidents**

In Sacramento, California, there have been attacks on refugees and their property. According to Randy Shiroi of the Human Rights and Fair Housing Commission of the City and County of Sacramento, many of these incidents have been for clearly racial reasons.

Shiroi said one of the most helpful reasons in responding to such problems in Sacramento has been the large, established
Asian-American community. "They have been sympathetic and helped with their contacts with the community, making community leaders aware of the problems." The Human Rights and Fair Housing Commission has worked with the school system and the police to improve relations, and the police have been encouraged to hire bilingual staff.

In nearby Davis, there are only a few refugee families. In May 1983, after several months of harassment of Vietnamese students by whites, a fight between white and Vietnamese students at the high school resulted in the death of Thong Hy Huynh. Early in October, James Pierman was found guilty of voluntary manslaughter in the incident. Some observers feel that he should have been convicted of a more serious crime.

The student body later dedicated a memorial planter box in Thong's honor. The planter was defaced with swastikas and slogans that included "Free James Pierman" and "Death to the Gooks." According to Shiroi, people in Davis rallied around the victim's family and raised money to help them. The Community Relations Service of the Justice Department is working with school officials and community leaders to prevent increased tension.

**Port Arthur Responds Positively to Tragedy**

The September 4 shooting of a Vietnamese man by a police officer in Port Arthur, Texas, has been used as an opportunity to improve communications between Vietnamese and the general community. The man, who had a history of emotional problems, was carrying a knife and hatchet, and was screaming at the officer to kill him.

Dr. Andre Van Chou, a Vietnamese leader in nearby Beaumont, said the Vietnamese were angry, but "didn't want the death to be in vain." Activity that had already begun was intensified, and the Southeast Texas Vietnamese Community Organization was formed.

The organization has worked with city officials in a very positive way, Chou said. The city responded favorably to several requests the Vietnamese community made following the shooting. The city asked for a federal investigation, which the U.S. Justice Department has begun. City Manager George Dibrell said he hopes there will be quarterly meetings with Vietnamese community leaders and that the city council will appoint some Vietnamese to some of its committees. He would also like the police to hire some Vietnamese officers.

Law enforcement officials, civil rights agencies, and refugee advocates urge that all incidents be reported to local police departments. If there is reason to believe that incidents are racially motivated, they can also be reported to local offices of the U.S. Department of Justice and field offices of the F.B.I., which has a civil rights unit.

Many states, cities, and counties have human rights or human relations commissions to deal with violence or discrimination on the basis of such factors as race or national origin. These offices can be found in local phone books or by calling the general phone number for the appropriate unit of government.

People who have information that would be relevant to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights study of racially motivated violence and other acts of bigotry against Asian and Pacific Island Americans and recent immigrants from Asia can contact the project director, Thomas R. Watson, in the commission's Washington office, (202) 376-8443.

The commission's ten regional offices and its complaint referral office in Washington, (202) 376-8516, can also be contacted by individuals with complaints about discrimination, violence, or harassment. The commission is a fact-finding agency with no authority to resolve problems.

All of these agencies emphasize that frivolous complaints hamper their ability to deal effectively with serious complaints.

**Recent Developments**

**HOW TO FINANCE CALIFORNIA HEALTH ACCESS SERVICES STIRRS CONTROVERSY**

This past spring, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) began to enforce a requirement that 85 percent of federal funds
to state social service programs be restricted to direct employment-related programs. California health care providers and state administrators have debated the feasibility and fairness of the new policy. In particular, they claim it has had a major impact on health accessing services, which provide language or cultural bridges in health care facilities.

The chief aim of the Office of Refugee Resettlement is to assist refugees to become economically self-sufficient. Accordingly, the agency's guidelines have since 1982 urged states to spend at least 85 percent of ORR social service funds for employment-related social services, including employment counseling and English language training. Whereas previously this apportioning of funds was loosely enforced, the agency began to require that states comply with it this year.

The state of California, which in the past has used 65 percent of its ORR social service allocation for programs directly related to employment, requested to be relieved of compliance with the requirement last March, according to ORR Director of Operations Dick Parkins. The request was denied, and thus began a series of exchanges between service providers, state officials, and ORR regarding the so-called 85/15 rule and how to maintain heretofore federally funded services. In particular, the 85/15 policy has given rise to debate as to what support services contribute to a refugee's self-sufficiency, and how health accessing services should be financed.

Employability a Factor in Using Funds
The aim of these services is to improve refugees' access to appropriate health care by ensuring clear communication between health care providers and patients regarding patient and provider roles and responsibilities; contextual factors in health care such as diet, rituals, and socialization; the emotional impact of illness; and follow-through on treatment.

In accordance with the new requirement, ORR agrees to fund health accessing services when they fall within the 85 percent category, that is, in cases where they would be considered "the most appropriate means to overcome a specifically identified obstacle to a refugee's employment," according to ORR Region IX Director Sharon Fujii. States may then determine how to allocate the remaining 15 percent to health accessing or to other social services, without regard to the refugees' employment status.

The state of California has relied solely on federal resources to fund health accessing services for refugees. With the recent restrictions in using ORR funds, most bilingual, multilingual and cultural interpreters were eliminated as of October 1. The state, under pressure from counties, is using its 15 percent for state Title XX programs, for in-home care, adult protection, child abuse and related services.

Parkins pointed out that California's significant Title XX budget can be largely attributed to an ever-increasing caseload of home-care recipients. Refugees retain benefits until their refugee status changes.

Services Not Available for "Those Who Need it Most" Concern has been voiced in California health circles that the population most in need of health care has been totally barred from receiving health access services. This includes refugees not considered employable—elderly (around 12% of refugees in San Francisco), pre-school and school-age children, mentally or physically disabled, and many women when they give birth. Together these constitute half the refugee population in California, according to voluntary agency sources.

After announcement of the 85/15 rule last Spring, the California Refugee Health Council (CRHC) detailed its concern to ORR about probable effects of the employment-related requirement. CRHC Executive Committee member Ron Rowell asserts that those refugees most in need of health accessing are recent arrivals, who often come from rural backgrounds, and are not as likely as previously arriving refugees to speak English or be familiar with Western medical practices.

Furthermore, Rowell claims that since nine out of ten refugees have some kind of health problem that requires attention when they first arrive, language and cultural interpretation is most needed in health care facilities at this early stage.

The council warned that lack of health access services could lead many refugees to avoid treatment for serious illnesses such as tuberculosis. Moreover, the group anticipates that the incidence of hospitaliza-
tion, disability and early death will increase. This could present risks not only to refugees, but also to the public at large.

California Gave Priority to Other Social Services  Parkins asserted that the 85/15 requirement is a necessary step in channeling limited federal resources for refugee assistance to employment-related services, which would thus contribute most to the development of refugees' self-sufficiency. Though Parkins agreed that health accessing services are needed, he commented that financing them should not be the burden only of the federal government.

Other states have not encountered difficulties to provide social services within the 15 percent ceiling, according to Parkins. "California made a determination of how to spend their allocation within our guidelines," said Parkins. He added, "The state made a commitment to apply substantial resources to in-home support services."

Lawsuit Charges Discrimination  The San Francisco Lawyers' Committee for Urban Affairs has responded to what it considers discriminatory practices by the state and federal government. The committee filed a class action suit on behalf of affected refugees against the Office for Refugee Resettlement and the California Office of Refugee Services in U.S. District Court in San Francisco. Attorney Robert Rubin contends that although the policy seems intended to assist employable refugees, "It will not work out in reality as nicely as it sounds on paper. In fact, we can expect an adverse impact on employability of refugees," Rubin said.

One plaintiff in the class-action suit is an employed refugee with chronically ill parents, one with cataracts, the other with a stomach disorder. Both must make bi-monthly visits to the hospital for their respective health problems. Since neither parent speaks English, the worker must, with the elimination of health accessing services, take time off work to bring them to the hospital appointments and translate. Rubin explained that this, in effect, not only takes her away from her work, but indeed jeopardizes her employment.

Problems will likely arise in emergency cases, Rubin went on. For example, the refugee who cannot answer questions or indicate type or source of pain may end up with unnecessary surgery in search of internal injuries that could be communicated verbally. Other miscommunications could profoundly affect the well-being of a patient in less obvious ways, he added.

Rowell expressed concern that refugees are not likely to be informed of their right to language interpretation and other access services. Parkins explained, however, that it is the responsibility of voluntary agencies under contract to the State Department to advise newly arrived refugees of this right.

CENTRAL AMERICAN YOUTHS DEPORTED OR DETAINED AT U.S. BORDER

Due process rights of children apprehended as they cross southern U.S. borders are violated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, legal advocates for the minors allege. Voluntary agency sources estimate that 150-300 minors from Central America enter the U.S. every month without accompanying adults. At any given time, an average of 200 youths arrested for illegal entry are detained, according to INS sources. And, in a rapid turnover, nine out of ten apprehended are deported.

INS Detention and Deportation Officer Don Looney estimates that 100,000 minors (under the age of 18) are caught trying to enter the U.S. every year.

Looney stated that most cross into Texas or California regularly to earn a living, to shine shoes or smuggle in cigarettes. He noted, however, an increase in the number of youths fleeing military conscription in war-torn Central America. Whereas many of the children are bound to join family in the U.S., youths are increasingly found to be travelling alone, often sent out by families seeking to remove them from danger.

As awareness of the situation of these youths has increased, legal advocates and service providers called for more information and have pointed to logistical, moral, and political problems raised by the minors' presence.

Scale of Presence Startling  Last year, legal advocates intercepted the deportation
of 16-year-old Jose Antonio Perez-Funez as he was being put on an airplane bound for San Salvador. The boy reportedly had been forced to sign a voluntary departure form and waive his right to request asylum following his arrest for illegally entering the U.S.

Perez-Funez is the named plaintiff in a class action suit filed by Gil Carrasco of the National Center for Immigrants' Rights against INS in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles. In January, Judge Rafeedie issued a court injunction in the case, specifying procedures for INS to advise minors of their rights and allow access to legal counsel.

Nevertheless, two weeks later, 14-year-old Mario Moreno, a resident alien from Santa Ana, California, was picked up by INS. He said he was intimidated into signing a voluntary departure form and not advised of his right to a hearing. He was deported to Mexico and spent five days trying to find his way back home to his family.

Following the Moreno incident, Los Angeles Judge Terry Hatter issued a nationwide ban on deportation of minors. The result was startling--after five days, 900 youths were collected in border patrol holding stations, according to INS, and local hotels were filled to accommodate them. This revealed for the first time the scale of apprehensions and deportations of minors from the U.S. border, observers suggest.

Juveniles apprehended by INS come in several categories. In some cases, children are held in INS custody as material witnesses so that the U.S. government can prosecute "coyotes" who smuggled them into the U.S. However, the vast majority of children held by INS do not fall within this category.

Although INS records more than one million apprehension cases each year, officials said INS statistics do not include information about age or sex of those detained. Some detainees are reportedly as young as three years old. Most small children caught are kept with a family member, usually their mother.

INS Uses Children to "Bait" Illegal Parents, Suit Charges A lawsuit filed in August charges that in southern California, INS holds children hostage to draw in their undocumented parents. In order to reclaim a child detained by INS, parents must appear personally, begin deportation proceedings, and waive all rights to protection from self-incrimination. Attorney Della Bahan of El Rescate, a Los Angeles social service agency, believes this is an unconstitutional procedure and violates the UN Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, to which the U.S. is party.

Bahan and Peter Schey of the National Center for Immigrants' Rights, Inc., filed the class action suit against INS. Named as a plaintiff in the suit is a four-year-old, known only as Orlando for fear of retaliation against relatives back home. His mother fled El Salvador after her husband was killed by a death squad, her brother "disappeared," and she herself received death threats. She escaped to the U.S. and earned enough money working for a year as a domestic to send for her son. Border agents found him hidden in a motor vehicle, and arrested him along with 11 other Salvadorans from 3 to 17 years old.

Orlando spent 17 days in INS custody while Bahan performed what she called "legal gymnastics" to have the boy released to his mother. Bahan ended up filing for legal guardianship and arranged $500 bond in order to temporarily reunite Orlando with his mother. He now faces deportation proceedings.

INS sources in both Washington and field offices said that the agency has to be very careful not to release children to just anybody. Whether or not the person is likely to appear for a deportation hearing, however, is also a major concern of INS agents, according to Detention and Deportation Officer Looney.

Need for Standard Procedures for Handling Children Cited Lauren Pressman of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) said such court cases are attempts by legal and children's advocates to clarify U.S. immigration procedures for handling minors and instigate changes where inadequacies or inconsistencies exist. A pivotal issue among legal and social service sources is the lack of standardized procedures for handling illegal minor entrants.

Problems in the treatment of apprehended and detained minors came to the attention of child welfare and refugee agencies
largely through the efforts of LIRS' Central American Concerns Program. Program Director Pressman has channelled reports from LIRS legal service projects to children's committees of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies and International Social Services.

A June 1984 LIRS briefing paper on Central American unaccompanied minors states, "To date there are no definitive procedures or directives from the INS to insure responsible treatment of Central American minors in the immigration process. Although guidelines on the treatment of minors in the INS system do exist, they are, however, open to free interpretation by local INS District Directors." Apprehension, processing, detention, and deportation are noted as areas of concern.

Besides these procedural problems, the report cites related problems that require monitoring, such as reported violations of due process rights and determination of responsible placements for children released on bond or to foster care.

**Information Gap Cited** Voluntary agencies cite a need for further information in order to respond to the situation. "The information gap that exists between INS policy guidelines and actual case histories, as related by legal representatives in the field, has resulted in a vacuum of rudimentary, documentable facts," the LIRS report states. "The basic questions, specific to minors, on the flow of children entering the U.S. from Central America, the rate of border patrol apprehensions, or the rate of voluntary departures back to Central America continue to remain unanswered."

Refugee Reports inquiries to INS Press Information, Detention and Deportation, and San Diego field offices for numbers of apprehended, detained, or deported minors met with the response that no such statistics are kept.

The LIRS report expresses concern about the disparity of information between INS and others working in the field. "For example, while the INS Central Office in Washington D.C. maintains that unaccompanied minors of 'tender years' [under 14 years] are neither placed on bond nor deported, documented cases reveal this INS contention as not only false, but routine activity."

Two organizations, the Refugee Policy Group and International Social Services-American Branch, are considering a project to gather basic information about the scope of the problem and, in particular, to examine the applicability of state child welfare services and standards.

**Older Minors Often Treated as Adults** Another problem identified by service providers is that minors age 14-17 are routinely treated as adults by the immigration service in deportation, detention, and bonding processes. They may be detained with adults in correctional facilities or have bond set for up to $7,500 for their release pending their deportation hearing. Some observers challenge the legality of this practice in the context of state child welfare standards.

Sometimes, knowing the age of entrants is beyond the control of INS. Often, the only document an entrant possesses is a tourist visa from Mexico, and since no one under the age of 18 can get the visa, juveniles often lie about their age. INS must then attempt to determine the true age of the detainee.

INS spokesman Verne Jervis told Refugee Reports that those apprehended have the right to request a hearing, but that many waive that right and offer to leave the U.S. voluntarily. He added that those who request asylum are often released on bond or to the custody of a family member, due to lack of facilities to hold them, until their cases can be reviewed. The increase in illegal entries has stretched limited resources to cope with them, Jervis said.

It is routine practice in many smaller border operations to put juveniles, particularly older males, into local jails until INS determines what to do with them. In what lawyers working on the issue call a very rapid turnover, juveniles are most often deported during this processing time. Advocates claim that they often have no access to legal counsel or any adult outside of INS. And, when faced with choices such as lengthy detention, ending up in deportation, or bonds that they have no means to meet, and lacking the benefit of legal counsel, they agree to depart the country.

Other minors in the past have been put into local juvenile detention facilities, practice now being stopped by the facility administrators because the vulnerable
Children from peasant backgrounds were frequently victimized by hard-core youth offenders.

Children Allegedly Denied Rights to Asylum Due to Minor Status Critics claim that children are often denied legal rights by virtue of their minor status. "Political asylum, for example, as an option to gain legitimate status, is often not adequately explained to minors," states the LIRS report.

Last March, attorney Patrick Hughes was called by Project Liberty, a legal aid agency in Harlingen, Texas, to assist children detained in the Rio Grande Valley. He was told by INS personnel there at the time that none of the minors in custody had requested a deportation hearing (i.e., to apply for asylum). But Hughes said after he explained their legal options to the five Salvadoran and Guatemalan children, not one expressed a preference to return to their country. Though Hughes faulted INS procedures, he added that many INS agents went beyond the call of duty to assist children.

Pressman contrasts the treatment of minors from Central America with U.S. policy toward minors from Southeast Asian countries who seek resettlement opportunities. U.S. guidelines for processing unaccompanied minors acknowledge that they are not able to articulate a fear of persecution. Accordingly, INS field officers are instructed to give them the benefit of the doubt. "What makes a 13-year-old Vietnamese different from a 13-year-old Salvadoran," asked Pressman, "regarding the sophistication they need to make an asylum claim?"

Several sources point to the problems of Central American juveniles seeking asylum in the U.S. as only one group affected by U.S. policy toward Central Americans that seek refuge here. Although the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees recognizes Salvadorans as prima facie refugees, the U.S. is the only government that systematically deports Salvadorans to their country of origin. Controversy continues as to the fate of returned people, which is extremely difficult to trace.

Conditions in Detention Facilities a Concern INS officials pointed out that the cost to construct and operate a government-run detention facility is far greater than contracting to local social service agencies or private firms to detain apprehended aliens in the hundreds of sites throughout the U.S. With regards to juveniles, INS Detention Officer Looney stated that local child welfare laws are applied in drawing up contracts with local agencies, such as the Salvation Army or Catholic Social Services.

Conditions in contract facilities, in Hughes' experience, however, need more careful monitoring. Several sources expressed concern about conditions in children's detention facilities. INS district offices try to monitor conditions in INS-operated and contract facilities, to ensure that they meet state child welfare standards, Looney said.

Lack of Access to Detention Facilities a Problem Lack of access to detention sites was also reported by attorney Kathy Alfred of El Rescate. She became legal counsel and guardian for four Guatemalan K'anjibal Indian teenagers in Los Angeles.

One of the boys, 16-year-old Gazpar, told Refugee Reports his story. When he was 12 years old, his parents were taken from his house in Sipacate, Guatemala, by "guerreros" while he hid under the bed, and they were killed. Gazpar fled the country this year, believing he too would be killed. After he was caught by the INS patrol, Gazpar recounted, he was asked if he would return to Guatemala. He said no, and refused to sign the voluntary departure form. He was placed in detention for two and a half months before being released on $2,000 bond to a foster home. Gazpar is now awaiting a deportation hearing.

To Alfred's knowledge, no one, including a priest, was able to visit the quarters in Pasadena where the boys were held with adults. There were no educational or recreational activities for the boys. There was one television for the hundred or so inmates, Gazpar said. He added that half the staff could speak Spanish.

One day, the Pasadena inmates were transferred to another facility in Englewood with no notification of where they were going or why. "They were all terrified that they were being deported," Alfred said. Once in the new facility, no phones were installed for several days. Some detainees missed hearings because they were
unable to notify their lawyers of hearing dates, she said.

**Cuban/Haitian Minors Program Cited as Model** Providing alternative care for juveniles held in U.S. custody is possible, according to Pressman of LIRS. She pointed out the Justice Department's Community Relations Service (CRS) special program for temporary care of Cuban and Haitian minors.

Authorized by Cuban-Haitian entrant legislation, this program is one aspect of CRS' program for Cubans and Haitians in Florida. Ken Leutbecker of CRS explained that two Dade County social service agencies under contract with CRS, Catholic Home for Children and Boystown, provide shelter care service for the youths, held in "administrative detention." The circumstances of their situations vary. Many are in the process of reuniting with family members via the Office of Refugee Resettlement; others without family here are placed in foster homes through child welfare agencies.

According to Leutbecker, services provided by these facilities include education, recreation, and language and acculturation for the minors.

**Projects and Programs**

**FAVORABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES PROJECT TO BE CONTINUED**

A national project designed to settle arriving refugees away from areas already densely populated by refugees has brought early employment and low welfare use. It has also built strong resettlement sites in four communities in Arizona and North Carolina. An Evaluation of the Favorable Alternative Sites Project (FASP) released by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in October says these and other positive factors outweigh the high out-migration from the sites.

As a result of the program's positive experience so far, ORR has expanded its support of FASP and announced that states can apply for funding to implement FASP projects.

According to the evaluation report, FASP was an outgrowth of ORR's placement policy, seeking to place fewer refugees in "impacted sites" and increase the employment and other opportunities for "free case" refugees by placing them where there are good job opportunities and a strong resettlement capacity and commitment. Free cases are refugees without immediate relatives in the U.S.

The FASP approach involved clustering of a single ethnic or nationality group in a location. Through careful site selection, planning, and supplemental ORR social service funds to allow case management and other needed services, FASP was to build sites which could attract additional refugees and minimize secondary migration to areas with dense refugee populations.

**FASP Stresses Early Employment** The October announcement of competitive FASP grants continues to emphasize good labor market conditions in site selection. The conditions generally required for a FASP site are an unemployment rate below the national average; an existing refugee population, but one not exceeding two percent of the general population; a low welfare dependency rate for the existing refugee population; voluntary agency capacity; and the capacity to provide employment, English language training, and other services.

Approximately $750,000 is available for FY 85 FASP projects. ORR estimates this amount could support up to eight project awards. FASP awards to states, separate from any other resettlement allocations, are to be used to provide a high level of planning and coordination among state and private agencies, service providers, and any refugee community organizations. Employment-related social services, caseload review and monitoring, and development of a management information data tracking system are also to be stressed.

**Initial Projects Completed** The initial FASP demonstrations to resettle 500 Cambodian refugees in Charlotte and Greensboro, North Carolina, and 600 Vietnamese in Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona, began in January 1983. The ORR evaluation covered these completed projects only. FASP projects to place 495 Khmer in the Norfolk and Richmond, Virginia, areas and another 425 Vietnamese in Arizona have also been implemented.

The ORR evaluation report, completed by Berkeley Planning Associates, called the
project "an unqualified success in securing employment for the FASP refugees within a short period of time after arrival." At least one member of each household was employed within three to four months, and by March 1984, many had more than one adult working or individuals working more than one job or a significant number of overtime hours; others had moved on to better jobs.

Similarly, both project sites had much lower welfare participation rates than the typical refugee experience--1 percent in Phoenix, 9 percent in Charlotte, 13 percent in Greensboro, and 27 percent in Tucson. The report noted that those counted as receiving cash assistance included many who were working but receiving cash supplements to their earned income. The high employment and low welfare usage rates, while due in part to the FASP design, also reflect the unattractively low AFDC and refugee cash assistance benefits available in the two states, according to the evaluation.

**Other Benefits Noted** Officials involved in the project pointed to significant benefits of FASP beyond the successful resettlement of the relatively small number of refugees involved. Richard Shapiro of ORR said, "FASP provided an opportunity for good communities to build programs." He said that Arizona might have been a declining resettlement area without FASP. Instead, it is a strong state program.

Regina Murphy-Darling, director of the Arizona refugee office, said FASP brought an appreciable number of refugees to the state, and the existing refugee communities rallied to support the new arrivals and were strengthened in the process. The mutual assistance associations (MAAs) were involved in the planning and, as a result, have become much more active. The whole refugee community is more stable now and is building, she said.

The success of the original 200 FASP refugees in Greensboro, North Carolina, has begun to attract secondary migration, according to Robert Edmundson, state refugee coordinator. The state also expected 480 refugees during 1984 through family reunifications with FASP refugees, according to the ORR evaluation.

**Ethnic Clusters Led to Stable Communities** Resettlement of ethnic groups in clusters over a short period of time was viewed as an important feature of FASP. According to the ORR report, it allowed refugees to retain their cultural identity and develop the support within the community that they would otherwise lack without anchor relatives. Jack Griswold of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) said that, for areas without substantial refugee populations, settling a significant number of refugees in a short time helped establish ethnic communities and kept people from leaving.

The most consistently mentioned benefit of the FASP approach was the impetus it gave to planning and cooperation. Edmundson thought FASP was excellent for the voluntary agencies and state and local governments because it involved early planning. "It's a good way to do business, to get together ahead of time rather than after refugees are resettled."

Murphy-Darling said, "FASP gave the agencies and the state a focus to work together in a planning effort, to look at the social services that were available and needs that were unmet." Knowing a definite number of refugees are coming within a certain period allowed everyone involved to plan collectively to meet their needs.

The commitment of everyone to the success of the demonstration projects and, particularly, to early employment was another important factor. Shapiro said, "Having the right value set, commitment to early entry into the labor force, is as critical as the presence of jobs in the location."

**Unforeseen Factors Caused Outmigration** The main problem in the initial FASP projects was the level of migration away from the sites. Approximately one year after the projects began, 3 percent of the FASP arrivals had left Greensboro, 52 percent had left Charlotte, 27 percent had left Tucson, and 45 percent had left Phoenix.

Several factors contributed to the out-migration from the project sites, and everyone involved stressed that the rates should not be seen as representing a failure. Shapiro said that some out-migration was due to the fact that some FASP families were not true free cases--either they had not provided accurate information in their biodata or their biodata had not been used accurately. Many of these families had already communicated with family members in
other places and left almost immediately upon arrival.

In Arizona, Shapiro said, a high risk was anticipated because California, with its generous welfare benefits, was so close. Given that, the out-migration rates from there were not startling. According to Murphy-Darling, some of the PASP refugees who left Arizona are coming back. She emphasized that the high employment levels and low welfare dependency among those who stayed are the important outcomes.

The out-migration from Charlotte was, according to Shapiro, "unforeseeable, beyond the control of the entire refugee system, and due to a destabilizing factor there." That factor was the activity of Church of the Latter Day Saints (LDS or Mormon) missionaries who assisted and, apparently, encouraged refugees to move. According to the ORR evaluation, LDS missionaries, in their effort to convert the newly arrived refugees, encouraged refugees to rely on LDS social services staff and the church, in contrast to the "self-reliance" message of the resettlement agencies, confusing the refugees and draining resettlement staff time and energy.

An overseas orientation program for PASP refugees specific to each site was apparently not successful. According to the evaluation, many refugees remembered little of the orientation material. The report said agency staff still felt that an effective overseas orientation, providing PASP refugees with knowledge about their future homes and what to expect there, would be useful.

**ORR Announcement To Bring Continuity** The goals of the new announcement, Shapiro said, are to regularize the program and make it available as a resource on a continuing basis, to provide resources beyond the first year for PASP refugees, and to have flexibility for multi-year resettlement. He said new features should make PASP more attractive to states. The period of projects is increased to as long as 33 months and the resettlement period to a maximum of 18 months. Family reunifications to PASP refugees arriving within the resettlement period can be counted toward the PASP caseloads.

Shapiro said PASP has important advantages for states. It gives them a chance to be thoroughly involved in planning and to receive resources that would not be available if the same number of refugees were being resettled through normal procedures.

**Volag Concerns Voiced** Officials at voluntary agencies, though, expressed concerns about the new announcement. Robert Wright of the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) expressed that agency's concern that early employment might not be given as much weight by ORR in selecting sites as USCC believes it should be given. He said that the agencies, based on their experience, know where the best employment prospects are; ORR had considered some sites, not ultimately selected for PASP, where USCC thought early employment would not be possible.

Geraldine Owens, also of the USCC national office, said that opening the program to application from any state could result in placing some of the limited number of free cases in states where the agencies had not intended to place them. "We are concerned that many states will be encouraged to submit applications when national voluntary agencies and the State Department aren't sure there will be enough free cases to satisfy the approved PASP sites without taking from other sites where they have established good employment, sponsors, and resettlement programs."

Griswold said that, though the concept of PASP was good, not enough resources were made available to make it work. While this is partly addressed by the new guidelines, he said, the funds are not enough to cover the costs, particularly for LIRS which must replace its usual church sponsorship model with an agency sponsorship model to handle the large number of PASP refugees in one place in a short period of time.

Shapiro pointed out that the new announcement, based on input from national volags, local affiliates, state refugee programs, and ORR regional staff, specifies that the number of awards will depend on the availability of "free case" refugees. It makes the employment situation in a prospective site the primary condition in considering an application.

Virginia Soberg-Rhyne, former director of refugee programs for Lutheran Family Services in Greensboro, thought PASP worked very well in Greensboro. She said that some Lutheran churches could not sponsor a family on their own. But, with PASP, they did as
much as they were able to do. Churches donated clothes or gave people rides to doctor appointments. With FASP, she said, resettlement relied on the community more.

**FASP for Other Refugee Groups?** While some observers argued that FASP is no longer necessary due to reduced refugee flows, several people suggested that FASP might be applicable for non-Southeast Asian refugee populations, for whom the concept is "not too late" and for whom ethnic clustering could be beneficial. Shapiro said there has been interest in a FASP for Ethiopian refugees, but there has been no application yet. He said there would have to be enough free cases assured by the State Department. The announcement does not limit FASP to Southeast Asians.

The ORR evaluation says that, although differences in refugee characteristics must be taken into account when generalizing from the results of the initial FASP sites to possible future sites, FASP is an efficient and effective approach to the settling of free cases, with the important benefit of building stable, alternative resettlement sites.

Murphy-Darling said that not enough attention had been given to FASP's positive results. "Wonderful things happened with FASP in different states with far fewer resources and without some of the advantages [of other touted efforts], and it hasn't received the recognition it should."

"An Evaluation of the Favorable Alternative Sites Project" final report and an executive summary of the report are available from ORR, Rm. 1229, Switzer Bldg., 330 C St. SW, Washington, D.C. 20201. They will be available from the Refugee Materials Center in Kansas City in the near future. The report contains detailed descriptions of the program and its results in Arizona and North Carolina, and includes case profiles of FASP refugees in both sites.

**Update**

The July issue of *Annals of Internal Medicine* has reported the findings of researchers in Seattle who have discovered a probable cause of Sudden Unexpected Nocturnal Death Syndrome (SUNDS), which affects Southeast Asian men. "...SUNDS is likely caused by ventricular fibrillations, essentially an irregular heartbeat," reports the August 10 *Refugee Newsletter* of the Saint Paul Foundation. Researchers noted that SUNDS is treatable if the person is known to be at risk, and that prompt emergency care—including cardio-pulmonary resuscitation and emergency paramedical teams equipped with defibrillators—can help people to survive.

**Resources**

**CRITIQUE OF STATE DEPARTMENT 1983 HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTS**


The introduction to the 85-page document notes that although, on the whole, the Country Reports provide "reliable and comprehensive information" about human rights abuses in the world, the reports suffer from "political bias...evident in the language that is used to describe sources of information about human rights abuses and in the context that is set for the discussion of abuses."

The reports on China, Cuba, Hungary, Poland, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe are found to be particularly well done." The critique stated that the reports on El Salvador, Honduras, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Uruguay and Zaire were "the most severely infected by political bias and accordingly the most misleading."

**Language Influences Image, Review Contends**

The human rights groups' critique states that human rights abuses in countries aligned with the United States are frequently referred to in the State Department reports as "allegations," or "charges," implying little validity. By contrast, descriptions of abuses committed by nations hostile to the United States tend to refer to "credible" or "reliable" reports of abuses, the critique says. Further, the Country Reports...
tend to refer to "allegations" of abusive practices by allies that go "unsubstantiated" by government sources. However, similar information is not generally mentioned for U.S. political adversaries, such as the Soviet Union or Cuba.

The critique goes on to say that political bias is shown in the State Department's assessment of organizations monitoring human rights conditions in their own countries.

For example, the critique says the description of the work of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Salvador is "distorted and discredited" in the Country Reports, in contrast to comparable organizations elsewhere.

The critique notes that human rights violations by some governments aligned with the U.S. are dismissed in the Country Reports as a response to anti-government violence, and blame is laid on terrorist organizations rather than government authorities.

The critique points out inconsistencies between Reagan administration policies and findings of the State Department reports, noting the example of Haiti.

The critique presents country-by-country analyses of the State Department's description of human rights conditions, and draws on specific examples.

The critique is available for $6 from the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights, 36 W. 44th Street, New York, NY 10036; or from America's Watch, 712 G Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20003.

CAMBODIAN MEDICAL AND COMMUNITY BOOKLETS

The Church Avenue Merchants Block Association in Brooklyn, New York, has completed a set of Cambodian guide books for new Southeast Asian community members. A similar set is also available in Vietnamese, and one in Lao is in process.

The 120-page booklet, "A Guide to Your Neighborhood," presents in both Cambodian and English practical information on education, housing, medical services, banking, sanitation, community organizations, crime prevention, recreation, and emergency services. Sectarian holidays are also explained. Interspersed with many illustrations, diagrams, and short anecdotes, the book is useful for persons of varying language and educational levels.

The 17-page "Medical Guide" in both Cambodian and English explains emergency medical procedures, such as who to call and what to say in an emergency, what to bring to the hospital, and necessary hospital vocabulary. Information for more routine practices is also outlined, such as medical histories, tests that may be required, and making appointments. The guide also explains patient rights, and lists emergency facilities and their phone numbers in the Brooklyn and New York City area.

Though the booklets make some references that are specific to the Flatbush neighborhood of Brooklyn, New York, much of the information and diagrams is universally applicable, particularly in the medical guide.

The guides are the result of an effort by Church Avenue community groups, public and private interests, and individuals. They are being distributed free of charge to community residents. To order, send $1.00 per guide to cover postage, and specify which guide(s) and language you would like, to Church Avenue Merchants Block Association (CAMBA), 474 Rugby Road, Brooklyn, NY 11226. Tel. (212) 282-2246.

CAMBODIAN TRADITIONAL MUSIC IN MINNESOTA CASSETTE TAPES

World Music Enterprises has available cassette recordings of Cambodian Traditional Music in Minnesota. The music includes 11 selections from both classical and village repertories played on customary instruments, such as the khim (dulcimer), tro (fiddle), khloy (flute), banjo (substituting for Chapey, or lute), skor (drum), and takhe (zither). Several traditional wedding songs are on the tape, and some of the selections include singing.

An 11-page booklet describing the music, instruments, and other background information in both Khmer and English is included with the cassette. Clifford Sloane is producer of the tape, and, with Sitheourn Chem, author of the booklet.

Also available is a cassette of Lao music, Khamvong Insixiengmai: Thinking of the Old Village. Each cassette is available for $8.00 plus $.50 postage per tape from World Music Enterprises, 717 Avondale Street, Kent, OH 44240. (Ohio residents must pay, in addition, 5 percent tax).
## Southeast Asian Refugees: Estimated Cumulative State Populations

Including Entries from 1975 Through 8/31/84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>259,100</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>24,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>57,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>32,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Other Territories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>705,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note
New adjustments for secondary migration were incorporated into these estimates as of 9/30/83.

### Adjusted
- Adjusted for secondary migration through 9/30/83, rounded to the nearest hundred.
- Fewer than 100.

### Source

---
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ODYSSEY OF LAO IU MIENT LEADS BACK TO CALIFORNIA

A dream of some land to farm led a small group of Lao Iu Mien refugees across the country in the spring of 1983--from San Francisco to land in rural West Virginia that reminded them of the hills they had once worked in Laos.

A disappointing setback there took most of the group--37 people--to Alabama, with prospects of factory jobs and hopes of some-day obtaining land in the area. In April, the Iu Mien returned to San Francisco and to the relatives they had once hoped would join them to build a community in West Virginia.

Foundation Provided West Virginia Land In 1982, the Lao Iu Mien Cultural Association began discussing its members' problems and their future in the U.S. According to Kouichoy Saechow, the Mien, once they stopped thinking they would only be in the U.S. temporarily, decided that farming was what they could do best. Saechow is a Lao who works with refugees for the Alameda County, California, welfare department.

The group just missed selection to receive land outside San Francisco owned by the San Francisco Foundation, said Saechao. At that time, Jerry Thompson, trustee of the Thompson Memorial Foundation, read an article about Mien refugees growing vegetables wherever small patches of land were available in Oakland. Thompson offered to lease the foundation's 873 acres of land near Dawson in his native West Virginia to the Mien for $1 a year.

Encouraged by Thompson's support and a preliminary trip by seven or eight members of the Iu Mien community to look at the land, Saechow said, a group of ten left in May 1983 and began work. They were concerned that there was no time to get assurances of support from the government, but Thompson said he was very positive about his willingness to help and about the group's future on the West Virginia land, Saechow said.

A second group arrived late in the summer and Saechow took two months leave from his job and joined them in October 1983. The group lived in a converted garage and school building and two farm buildings. They had begun gardening and cutting firewood for the winter.
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Iu Mien Ordered Off the Land  But Thompson changed his mind, complaining that the Mien had not kept to their agreement and that they were not making enough progress in building homes and preparing the land. Thompson ordered them off the land by the end of November.

The situation brought national press coverage. Thompson's characterization of the Mien as "professional welfare recipients [who lack] eagerness to work" differed from the reports by West Virginia refugee service providers that the Mien had been working very hard. Debra Simantara of the U.S. Catholic Conference's Migration and Refugee Service office in Charleston said, according to the Charleston Gazette, "Their whole reason in coming here was to get off the welfare system in California and become self-sufficient."

People in the area "were very helpful," Saechow said. Following the group's eviction, there were offers of land, food, and other support. But the Office of Refugee Resettlement in Washington told the group that there was an established Iu Mien community in Montgomery, Alabama, and that there were good prospects for jobs there. Saechow said, "The group decided [Montgomery] was their best choice, better than moving to California to be on public assistance." People in the Dawson area raised $3,000 to help the group move, and the state of West Virginia provided emergency assistance.

On Thanksgiving Day, 1983, the group moved to Alabama.

Most Found Jobs in Alabama  The group of Iu Mien had a very favorable reception in Montgomery, according to Pat Hall of the Montgomery New Life School, a refugee service provider affiliated with the Montgomery Baptist Association. State Refugee Coordinator Joel Sanders said the Baptist Association staff did "a tremendous amount of work prior to the arrival of the group," arranging for housing, furniture, and food to be available.

But the group was disappointed to find that a plant where about 250 refugees were already working, with fairly good pay and benefits, was doing little hiring when they arrived, according to Sanders.

Still, of 18 employable adults in seven households, most had full- or part-time jobs while they were in Montgomery, Sanders said. Although ORR had provided an emergency grant of $49,625 to assist them, many had become self-sufficient. According to Sanders, the expenditure for cash assistance for the group declined steadily, from $3,006 in November 1983 to $1,195 in March and $233 in April 1984.

But, Hall said, the jobs were not the jobs they wanted, in part because most of the full-time work was nearly 50 miles away from Montgomery.

Missed Relatives, Lacked Leader  During the months they were in Montgomery, Hall said, they were getting homesick and there was talk of California. "We tried to convince them it would get better even if they didn't have the job they wanted now." She pointed out that the Iu Mien who had lived there longer were buying cars and homes. There was good farming land around the small community where several of the group had found jobs. But, Hall said, "it required that they work and save money to do it, and they weren't able to stick to it long enough."

The Iu Mien left Alabama because their jobs were not secure, Saechow said. There were many layoffs. Also, they felt that the lack of a leader, someone they could trust and believe, meant that their relatives in San Francisco would not move there. Saechow said the group wanted him to join them "because I created the problem for them when I first began talking of agricultural resettlement." They wanted him to move there so they could plan together for the future, build a community, and buy land, he said. Hall and Sanders agreed that when Saechow was unable to move to Montgomery, the group's motivation to stay began to fade.

Sanders said that, looking back, the chances of the group staying anywhere outside California, where they had established ties and had close relatives, were quite remote. Without very good jobs or some land where they could be self-sufficient, no place would have been attractive enough to overcome those ties, he said.

Group Returned to San Francisco  The Iu Mien who had stayed in Montgomery returned to San Francisco at the end of April. They stayed with relatives, and the Southeast
Asia Resettlement Center helped them find jobs. Now 18 of them are working, and all of the families have apartments of their own. Saechow said, "I feel good they're back and able to manage." He said that only a few, those who are unable to work, are still receiving cash assistance.

The group's goal now is a community center. A survey is being conducted to see how many people are interested in a center, a place of their own where they can have recreation, meet, and practice their religion.

They have not been talking about land. People have offered them land, but they have refused it. Saechow said, "People still have that feeling, but they know they can't talk about it until they have money."

Recent Developments

INS ANNOUNCES PROGRAM TO GRANT PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS TO MARIEL CUBANS

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) has announced a program to grant permanent resident status to eligible Cubans who entered the U.S. during the 1980 Mariel boatlift. According to an INS statement issued November 19, INS expects up to 100,000 of the 125,000 Cubans who came to the U.S. during the boatlift to register during the program.

Permanent resident status for the Cubans is authorized under the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966. That statute allows the attorney general to adjust to "lawfully admitted permanent resident" the status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba, has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the U.S., and has been physically present in the U.S. for one year.

Registration Period Extended The first step of the program will begin December 3, 1984. INS will ask all Cubans who entered the U.S. during the Mariel boatlift--April 15 to October 10, 1980--and who are not yet U.S. permanent residents or citizens to register with INS through participating local voluntary agencies.

The INS announcement said that registration would be conducted between December 3 and December 31, 1984. After concern was expressed about the limited registration period, INS decided to extend it through January 31, 1984.

Individuals are to register by filing a Form I-104 during December and January. Those who register will be the first scheduled for adjustment of status interviews. There will be no penalties for those who fail to register, but they will not be interviewed until after those who do register.

According to INS, the purpose of the registration is to provide the agency with the current addresses of those expected to apply for resident status so that they can be contacted for interviews. The information will be used to update computer files, estimate the workload, and transfer INS records to appropriate offices. A Federal Register notice of November 23, 1984, said that the Mariel Cubans registered when they first arrived, but they have not been required to update their registration since October 31, 1981.

Local Volags Encouraged to Participate

Forms needed for the December registration were to be available around November 30 from local voluntary agencies who agree to participate in the program. According to INS, the national voluntary agencies which would encourage their local affiliates to participate were: American Council for Nationalities Service, Church World Service, Cuban-American National Foundation, International Rescue Committee, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, U.S. Catholic Conference Migration and Refugee Service, and World Relief.

In the program's second step, INS will conduct interviews and issue decisions regarding resident status. This phase is scheduled to begin after April 1, 1985.

While INS said that the vast majority of those eligible live in Florida, New Jersey, New York, and California, all INS offices will accept and adjudicate applications.

Permanent Resident Status Not Automatic

According to INS, permanent resident status confers most of the privileges of U.S. citizenship and is required before citizenship can be attained. Some Mariel Cubans who are granted permanent resident status may be eligible to apply for citizenship as early as April 1985, according to information provided by INS.
Permanent residency is not automatic, and the Cuban applicants must meet regular requirements for adjustment of status. James Hoffman, assistant director for immigration affairs at the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC), said that some of the Marielitos not in custody are still subject to exclusion, particularly on grounds of mental disability or disorders and past criminal activities. Registering Cubans who are clearly excludable would be a "waste of time and may just cause trouble for them."

INS stressed that Cubans now held in INS detention because of their criminal or mental records will not be covered by this program. "The government will continue to negotiate with the government of Cuba to press for the repatriation of these persons," the release stated.

INS further announced that a centralized federal record check with the FBI and a check of FBI fingerprint files will be conducted on all applicants under this program. Also, each applicant will be required to obtain a police clearance from every municipality where he has lived for at least six months since arrival in the U.S.

Hoffman questioned requiring such certificates of Cubans who have already applied for adjustment of status, but whose applications INS has not processed. He also thought obtaining the police certificates would be a problem for Cubans who were settled in jurisdictions away from the Miami area.

Program Does Not Include Haitians Voluntary agency representatives have expressed concern that the INS program does not provide for Haitians who entered the U.S. during roughly the same period as the Mariel Cubans. INS information states it "has no legislative or administrative authority to adjust the Haitian group to permanent resident status at this time. Such a program would require passage of legislation by Congress."

According to INS, the attorney general had been holding adjustment decisions on Mariel Cubans under the Cuban Adjustment Act, in order to give Congress an opportunity to act on a solution for both the Cubans and Haitians that was recommended by the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy in 1981. The failure of Congress to act on comprehensive legislation preceded INS's decision to go on with legalization for Cubans only.

INS Decision to Change Registration Period Seen as Positive Step Hoffman said that although there were disagreements about the process between the voluntary agencies and INS, the extension of the registration period resolved one key difference. He hoped that the change was a sign of greater cooperation and that INS would talk to the voluntary agencies before announcing programs involving their cooperation.

"We are cooperating because we want to get for the Cubans what is their legal due," Hoffman said. He added that national voluntary agencies can only encourage local affiliates to help in the program. There are no funds available to local affiliates for participating. Immigration counseling offices may seek donations from those they assist, however.

INS officials anticipate it will take approximately one year to complete processing of these applications. The agency predicts that planning and the assistance being provided by the voluntary agencies will minimize disruption of other agency activities.

The length of delay for other potential immigrants who are waiting for visas will not be affected by the program, according to INS, because the Cuban Adjustment Act calls for adjustment of status without the use of an allocation from the overall total of available visas.

LAW SUIT SEEKS TO STOP HAITIAN INTERDICTION PROGRAM

A complaint filed in federal district court in Washington charges that the U.S. government's Haitian interdiction program deprives Haitians stopped at sea and returned to Haiti of their rights under American and international law. The suit asks the court to order the program stopped.

The Haitian Refugee Center (HRC), a nonprofit organization in Miami that promotes the well-being of Haitian refugees, and two of its members filed the suit on July 24 against Admiral James S. Gracey, commandant of the Coast Guard, and Alan C. Nelson, Immigration and Naturalization Service
commissioner. The complaint prepared by the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights argues that the program implemented by the two agencies serves the "repressive purposes and laws of the Government of Haiti."

U.S. Returns Haitians Stopped at Sea The interdiction program began in October 1981 after President Reagan ordered that certain vessels carrying undocumented aliens be stopped on the high seas and returned to Haiti. The president's order was based on his determination that illegal migration by sea of large numbers of undocumented aliens was "detrimental to the interests of the United States."

According to motions filed by the Department of Justice in response to the complaint, a cooperative agreement between the U.S. and Haitian governments gave permission to U.S. authorities to board Haitian ships, make inquiries about those on board, and, "if a violation of U.S. or appropriate Haitian law is discovered," to return the vessel and those on board to Haiti.

The agreement specified that the U.S. would not return any Haitians whom the authorities found to qualify for refugee status. If there is any indication that anyone on board an interdicted boat may qualify as a refugee, the INS officer on board is to conduct an interview. If the interview suggests that a bona fide claim for refugee status may exist, arrangements are to be made to bring the person to the U.S.

U.S. Says Returned Haitians Not Harmedited Of approximately 450 vessels boarded for questioning on the high seas between Haiti and the U.S. in the three years since interdiction began, 78 have been interdicted—that is, returned to Haiti. All 1,891 Haitians aboard those ships were returned to Haiti, according to INS, none having indicated sufficient evidence of eligibility for refugee status to warrant their being brought to the U.S.

The suit cites INS figures which show that "the rate of interdictions has increased dramatically." Thirty-four vessels were interdicted in all of 1983, compared to 32 in the first half of 1984.

The interdicted Haitians are returned to Port-Au-Prince, Haiti, where they are processed by Haitian officials and released to the Haitian Red Cross in the presence of INS officers and interpreters. The State Department has a program to conduct interviews with returned Haitians approximately six months after their return. So far, 27 percent of the returned Haitians have been interviewed, and the department found no reports of a returned Haitian being "harmed in any way by the Haitian government upon his or her return to Haiti."

An affidavit filed by lawyers for HRC states that they have been "reliably informed" that government records of the on-board interviews show that some Haitians have expressed a fear of returning to Haiti because of prior persecution. In some instances, the records allegedly show mistreatment of previously interdicted Haitians upon their return to Haiti. Nevertheless, according to the information cited in the affidavit, the Haitians have been returned to Haiti and not allowed to apply for asylum in the U.S.

The government has said there is no such information in the interview records and has declined the plaintiff's request to make them available.

Violation of Refugee Act, UN Protocol Alleged The lawsuit against the government argues that the interdiction program violates the Refugee Act of 1980 and the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). The interdiction procedure of on-board interviews, without any counsel for the Haitians, occurs, the suit says, "under threatening circumstances"—there is a Haitian naval officer aboard the Coast Guard ships—and evades the intent of Congress in establishing uniform asylum procedures in the Refugee Act.

The suit also alleges that interdicted Haitians are denied the protections provided by INA procedures for the exclusion of aliens.

By returning the interdicted Haitians to Haiti where, the suit alleges, they may face persecution, the government violates both the Refugee Act of 1980 and the non-refoulement provisions incorporated into the UN Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, to which the U.S. is party.

The suit argues that these questions are not mere procedural matters in the case of Haitians because Haiti's record of human rights abuses suggests that a substantial
number of Haitians would have legitimate asylum claims if they had the chance to apply.

The State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1983 documents continued human rights abuses in Haiti and states that the Haitian government continued "occasionally to arrest persons arbitrarily and to beat and torture some." But the report says that "the Haitian Government has not prosecuted [interdicted Haitians who have been returned to Haiti] for departing without proper documentation, a violation of Haitian law."

According to Arthur Helton of the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights, however, there is recent evidence that those returned to Haiti, if they left to seek asylum, are considered treasonous, and some have been imprisoned.

Some sources suggested that the State Department's follow-up interviews may miss those who have been imprisoned and that the human rights situation in Haiti makes it likely that people would not tell State Department officials if they had been harassed. State Department officials told Refugee Reports they could not comment on such issues while the motions were still being considered by the court.

**Suit Alleges Denial of Due Process and Discrimination** The suit also argues that the government is acting without legal authority. Depriving the Haitians of their liberty and forcibly returning them to Haiti is labeled a denial of due process as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

The suit further alleges that the interdiction program violates U.S. extradition laws, in particular the extradition treaty with Haiti, as well as accepted principles of international law which allow people to go abroad to seek asylum.

The plaintiffs further argue that the interdiction program violates the non-discrimination provisions of the UN Protocol. Although a Justice Department official testified before Congress in 1981 that Haitians made up only 2 percent of the undocumented aliens in the U.S., the plaintiffs charge that there is no comparable program to stop the undocumented movement of aliens from other countries. The interdiction program was designed exclusively to stop black Haitian boat people from entering the U.S., the plaintiffs assert.

**Government Denies the Complaint** It remains to be seen whether the issues and the factual questions raised by the suit will receive a full hearing, as government lawyers filed a motion to dismiss the case on September 17.

They argued that the court does not have jurisdiction over matters that take place on the high seas. Furthermore, they said, the plaintiffs--HRC and its members--cannot claim to be injured by the action, but are only asserting the interests of aliens outside the U.S. who seek to enter illegally. Also, the government argued, the questions raised by the suit are political--matters of foreign affairs and immigration delegated to the president and Congress, and outside judicial review.

The government also filed a motion for summary judgment—a request that the court decide the case in the government's favor without a trial because, they claim, there are no disputed factual issues and the government is clearly acting within its authority.

**Plaintiffs Respond** On October 1, the plaintiffs responded to these motions. Their statements claim that the interdiction program is designed to avoid judicial review and circumvent U.S. laws. According to the statement, "The very procedure which violates the rights of the refugees renders the refugees themselves incapable of either bringing this action on their own behalf or authorizing HRC to do so for them. Their return to Haiti, and to the custody of Haitian officials, exposes them to the risks of harassment, detention, torture, and death."

The government rejects such claims, arguing that the president has authority to establish and carry out the interdiction program, that no rights are being violated by the program, that interdiction procedures include adequate safeguards to prevent legitimate asylum-seekers from being returned, and that returned Haitians are not being detained or persecuted.

U.S. District Court Judge Charles Ritchie heard oral argument on all pre-trial motions on November 13. Judge Ritchie concluded the hearing by commending HRC for bringing the
lawsuit. He said, "While this doesn't imply that I agree with [HRC's] legal position, the suit raises an important public issue. The humanitarian concerns expressed affect me deeply as a human being."

AGE DISCREPANCIES CAUSE PROBLEMS FOR OLDER HMONG REFUGEES' SSI APPLICATIONS

The Social Security Administration has denied Supplemental Security Income to some Hmong refugees, ruling that they are ineligible because they are less than 65 years old. The Hmong claim that they are over 65 but lied about their age to U.S. officials in refugee camps in Thailand out of fear that they would not be admitted to the U.S. if they were too old.

Older refugees, like older citizens, are eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) if they are over 65, have low income, and are not eligible for regular Social Security benefits.

Hmong refugees have two special problems in trying to establish their age for SSI claims. According to Social Security Administration (SSA) policies, public records from near the time of birth are given the most credence. The older Hmong generally have no such formal documentation. Ken Grim of SSA's Office of Retirement and Survivors' Insurance said that age determination is especially difficult with Hmong because age is a nebulous concept in their culture.

Hmong Feared U.S. Would Deny Entry to Elderly

Refugee advocates in Minnesota and California point to another factor that has been working against Hmong applicants. The Hmong apply for SSI, claiming dates of birth that make them over 65 years old. But their immigration records show more recent dates of birth, which would make them less than 65. SSA gives more value to these records, largely because they were filed earlier and not in connection with an application for benefits. As a result, SSA has usually determined that the younger age is the correct one and has denied benefits.

Glenda Potter, an attorney with the Lao Family Community of Minnesota, said the Hmong claim they were told by Jerry Daniels, a U.S. official in Thailand, that they would not be allowed to go to the U.S. if they were over 65. He allegedly told the older Hmong to report a false, younger age on their I-94 forms and change it when they arrived in the U.S. Other refugee advocates confirmed that Hmong refugees who were in different camps tell the same story. Jerry Daniels, who died in Thailand in 1983, reportedly worked for the U.S. with the Hmong in Laos during the Vietnam War and was trusted by them.

The U.S. has no policy prohibiting admission of older refugees. Mac Thompson of the U.S. Agency for International Development, who was Jerry Daniels' supervisor in Thailand, said he did not believe that Daniels would have given the Hmong this incorrect information. He said a more likely explanation was camp rumors based on the tendency, in the fall of 1975, for the U.S. to admit nuclear rather than extended families. He added that Daniels was the most well-known American to the Hmong, so they remembered his name.

SSA Uses I-94 Birth Date

According to Potter, SSA almost always denies Supplemental Security Income benefits to Hmong refugees whose claims are based on INS records which have been corrected at the refugees' request since arrival in the U.S. Others involved in the situation said that SSA claims representatives automatically request the I-94 date of birth record from INS and use the date least advantageous to the applicant. Potter said she knew of only one case in the Minneapolis area where a claim with conflicting birth dates was approved by SSA on the initial application.

Appealed claims are reconsidered by a second claims representative. A further appeal is reviewed by a U.S. administrative law judge. Potter said 15 of her Hmong clients have had hearings before administrative law judges over the last year. In 12 cases, their decisions were in favor of the earlier birth dates claimed by the refugees. The other decisions were unfavorable to the applicants, Potter said, but they were able to apply successfully for SSI disability benefits instead of SSI old age benefits.

Grim said that the difficulties in determining Hmong age probably account for differences in how SSA offices and administrative law judges have evaluated these claims. In particular, he pointed to
delayed birth certificates issued in Laos in the 1970s and the lack of specific guidance in SSA's manuals on assessing Hmong claims.

**Policy To Consider All Evidence**  Although the procedures and priorities are complicated, the basic policy for evaluating all SSI applicants is to find, within reason, the best evidence possible, according to Sandy Crank, associate commissioner for policy at SSA. William Cooper, a program policy officer at SSA, said that policy requires SSA officials to put forth efforts to get evidence that would help reach an accurate age determination.

Cooper and Crank agreed that it would be inconsistent with policy to accept the least advantageous date of birth without trying to develop other possible sources of evidence. The Program Operations Manual System (POMS) manual instructs SSA representatives, where there is a difference between the date of birth claimed and that indicated by documentary evidence, to "discuss the matter with claimant. Determine and record in file the basis for the claimant's belief regarding his or her correct [date of birth]."

According to Potter, administrative law judges have been good about following such a policy when appealed claims reached them. They have learned about Lao history and culture and ask Hmong applicants questions to help determine their ages. These include questions about their memories of an earthquake or a "crazy war" during their childhood or about how many children they had when the Japanese came. They have also taken into consideration the refugees' claims that they were led to believe they would be denied admission to the U.S. if they told the truth about their age when their initial INS record was established.

**SSA Representatives Not Considering Evidence** But, Potter said, while reviewing all evidence may be policy for SSA representatives, "in Minnesota, they're just not doing it." In particular, they do not examine the circumstances surrounding the INS record of the Hmong refugees' date of birth and other non-documentary evidence of their age, she said.

A source involved in the issue suggested that SSA's use of the least advantageous birth date without fully developing the evidence creates legal questions of whether SSA can depart from published regulations and whether it is valid to treat refugees differently from other applicants.

A misunderstanding may be the source of refugee advocates' concern that SSA has a written policy to take the least advantageous date of birth for aliens when there are conflicting dates. The agency's POMS manual instructs claims representatives to "establish the least advantageous [date of birth]" when INS records and SSI applications have different birth dates and the representative cannot determine which was established earliest. According to Grim, that is a very limited situation. If there is other evidence, he said, it must be considered.

But SSA has routinely taken the date of birth established closest to the time of the refugee's entry into the U.S., according to Valerie Bogart, an attorney currently with the Legal Aid Society in New York, who formerly handled Hmong SSI appeals in Minnesota. That is the date on the refugees' I-94, even if they had their date of birth changed by INS after arrival and even if there are supporting documents from Laos.

According to Bogart, SSA ignores the revised INS date of birth records and claims that refugees have had them changed only to establish eligibility for SSI benefits. This, Bogart said, violates SSA regulations that require representatives to weigh all the evidence.

**Lawsuit Reverses SSA Decision** The failure to consider evidence other than the I-94 resulted in a lawsuit handled by Bogart on behalf of two Hmong refugees in Minnesota. The denial of their SSI applications in 1982, based on the more recent birth date contained in their INS records, was upheld upon reconsideration and upon review by an administrative law judge (ALJ).

In March 1984, a U.S. magistrate in the U.S. District Court of Minnesota found that the "decisions are not supported by substantial evidence and recommends that these cases be remanded for further evidentiary proceedings." Since there had been a conflict between the ages shown in the documents in the claim, "it was incumbent upon the ALJ to ascertain the circumstances surrounding the creation of each of these documents and to require additional evidence if
the evidence submitted was not convincing."
U.S. District Court Judge Harry H. MacLaughlin overruled the government's objections to the magistrate's report and recommendation and sent the cases back to an administrative law judge for further review. Judge MacLaughlin criticized the ALJ for failing in the "duty to develop the facts fully and fairly, particularly when the claimant is not represented by counsel"...and is unable to speak English."

He also rejected the government's argument that the plaintiffs lied once and, therefore, cannot be believed. Judge MacLaughlin ruled that the ALJ should have asked about the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the plaintiffs' INS records of birth dates.

The government said that the refugees' assertion that they lied because they were told they were too old to enter the U.S. is not credible because INS does not consider age in its immigration decisions. The government objection cited two congressional reports to defend this position. Judge MacLaughlin wrote, "Unfortunately, the Court doubts that the plaintiffs routinely read congressional reports, and thus, a camp rumor about age being a factor in whether one would be able to leave a war-torn nation to be reunited with one's family in the United States should be considered as an extenuating circumstance in determining whether plaintiffs misrepresented their ages in the I-94s."

**Second Hearing Approved Refugee's Claim**

In September, a different administrative law judge found that all evidence other than the I-94 supported one of the Hmong refugees' claim of being 74 years old. He decided that the refugee was eligible for SSI benefits.

Included in the evidence he considered were testimony of the refugee's children about their age, a delayed birth certificate issued in Laos in 1970, the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the I-94 birth date record, the reports of two doctors familiar with elderly Hmong patients concluding that the applicant was at least 72 years old, and the ALJ's own observations of the refugee's physical appearance during the hearing.

According to Bogart, the federal court decision of Judge MacLaughlin, including the magistrate's report and recommendations, "could have precedential value for other similar cases." Bogart also felt that the administrative law judge's decision in the court-ordered hearing "is a good example of the kinds of evidence and reasoning advocates should present in similar cases."

**SSA Develops Policy on Hmong Birth Documents**

The problems associated with age determination for Hmong applicants for SSI benefits has drawn the attention of SSA officials. Crank said, "We do, as a result of court decisions and ALJ reversals, re-emphasize policy that is not being carried out properly, or even modify policy."

The problem with evaluating Hmong claims led SSA to investigate, with the cooperation of the State Department and other agencies, the meaning and value of the Lao documents Hmong sometimes present as evidence of their date of birth, according to Grim. As a result, he said, SSA's Office of International Policy issued new instructions to the field, updating the procedures manual (POMS), on documents from Laos in general and specifically about the Hmong.

According to an SSA spokesman, the new instructions say that claims representatives can use Lao birth records and should question Lao claimants to find why they gave different birth dates to INS. If there is no reason to doubt the claimant, the representative can accept the Lao record.

**Projects and Programs**

**VIDEO PROJECT IN ARIZONA INTRODUCES FAMILY PLANNING METHODS**

A short time after nurse-midwife Angela Lucas began work at a clinic in Tucson, she was requested to help in a delivery for a Vietnamese woman. Lucas assisted with the home birth, and thus began a working relationship as midwife to refugee families in the community.

Lucas said Southeast Asian women traditionally confide in village midwives about pregnancy, child care, and related health concerns. Being in this position, Lucas had the opportunity to develop trusting relationships with many women and learn of their needs and concerns. "Because I had
delivered many refugee women's babies in the home setting, I became a referral source about birth control." Lucas found that although many of the women had been exposed to family planning education, they still had fundamental questions about whether or not to use it.

In 1983, on the other side of town, R.N. Judy Kulig was conducting extensive interviews with Cambodian women in the community to study their views about sexuality and how it relates to birth control. This year-long community health project for her master's degree work, broached a "highly sensitive and not culturally appropriate" topic for discussion among the refugee women.

Birth Control Information Needed In their separate work, Kulig and Lucas encountered what they considered to be a high rate of abortions among the women, and found that abortion was being used as a means of birth control. They concluded that this was due to several factors. "Fertility awareness was not as necessary [in their home countries] for these women as here," Lucas stated. For the most part, Cambodian and Vietnamese women from largely agrarian background did not need to use birth control in the past, because of "natural spacing." She explained that when women live on low-caloric diets and do heavy physical labor, such as field work, they ovulate much less. If, in addition, they breastfeed, it can take 18 months to two years from a birth before they become fertile again. Lucas said that in Cambodia under Pol Pot, extreme malnutrition caused many women to become amenorrheic, or infertile, at least temporarily.

Those women who are Buddhist believe in reincarnation, that the birth of a baby embodies the spirit of someone who has passed away, such as a mother. When a pregnancy is terminated, it is interpreted as the spirit's emergence into the world being put off until later. Abortions are referred to as "taking the baby out."

The nurses believed the high abortion rate reflects the need to know about alternatives to pregnancy. They point out that although Cambodian and Vietnamese women may have a more open view towards abortion, repeated abortions are detrimental to the mother's health.

Kulig and Lucas concluded that the women did not understand the Western approach to birth control because they had had limited exposure to it. Though family planning information is available in the U.S. in Vietnamese or Khmer, it often presumes an acceptance of Western understanding of body functions and birth control, according to Kulig. "For example, not all people believe that ovulation occurs 14 days before menstruation," she said, and therefore materials that discuss fertility without specifying that assumption "totally miss the mark."

"Imagine what they go through when they go to a clinic with a translator and [they} drag out these birth control things," Lucas said. "They listen politely to the information, embarrassed, and then go home and may well have more babies."

Educational Tool Developed Kulig and Lucas settled on a plan to produce a videotape in Vietnamese and Khmer languages, that would bridge cultural and experiential gaps, and prepare the women to absorb the technical "how-to" information already available. Several women assisted by Lucas in home delivery of their babies or interviewed by Kulig in her research collaborated with them in the development of the video.

With encouragement from the Arizona Refugee Council in Phoenix and the Tucson Refugee Council, production began in October 1983. Kulig and Lucas themselves financed the production costs, and the University of Northern Arizona Nursing Department donated taping equipment and facilities. The time, energy, and labor donated by many volunteers contributed to the video's overall success, according to a spokesperson for the Arizona State Refugee Resettlement Office.

The producers chose not to find professional actresses or students to appear in the show, but women who have similar backgrounds to the target audience, so that viewers would more likely relate to them and the ideas introduced.

The idea won mixed reviews from refugees and immigrants, as cultural and experiential gaps needed to be bridged. Vietnamese, for example, are embarrassed to publicly discuss pregnancy and birth control. Moreover, earlier immigrants to Arizona who had had greater exposure to Western culture and were more often from urban areas tended to see less need for dealing with family planning than their rural counterparts.
Approaching Women on Their Own Terms

A few persons interpreted the nurses' efforts as trying to stop women from having babies. Lucas felt this response was understandable as most refugees they worked with had lost family members in "the holocaust." Many had thought they would never be able to have children again, and it therefore became very important to them to replace lost family members.

Because of the sensitivity of the topic, the video producers decided it was very important to approach the project on the women's own terms. The Cambodian women shown in the video chose to sit around a table drinking tea, discussing their feelings about being pregnant and their desire to have more control over it. The Vietnamese women, by contrast, preferred to be more concealed, talking in silhouette.

Lucas commented, "We felt it was more valuable to have the information than whether or not they were seen."

There is no elaborate discussion about the body and its functions in the video, or how to use various birth control methods, side effects, etc. Rather, the video is intended to prepare women so that they can make use of existing educational materials about birth control.

Video Medium is Versatile

With the increasing use of video machines in homes, Kulig and Lucas thought videotapes would be a better medium than film or slides to maximize circulation and access to the material, as well as to offer some privacy in viewing them. An assessment form is included to gather responses from viewers and advocates to apply in future materials. Kulig and Lucas see a need to create similar culturally sensitive materials for other groups, such as Lao women, and on other topics, such as health problems of newborns and children.

Completed this past August, the 1/2" VHS videos are available for organizations or individuals to purchase. To order, specify which video is desired (Vietnamese or Khmer language), send name and address along with $15.00 to Family Planning Video, Arizona Refugee Council, P.O. Box 37165, Phoenix, AZ 85069. Phone inquiries about the video can be made to the Arizona State Refugee Resettlement Program, (602) 628-5897.

SUDAN STUDY REFLECTS UNHCR EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF DISABLED REFUGEES

A recently completed study of the training and rehabilitation needs of disabled refugees in the Sudan estimates there may be as many as 6,000 job-ready and trainable disabled refugees there. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees contracted for the study as part of its current special effort to assist handicapped refugees.

This special effort began in December 1981 when High Commissioner Poul Hartling, in keeping with the International Year for Disabled Persons, established a Special Trust Fund for Handicapped Refugees with the $180,000 Nobel Peace Prize awarded to UNHCR.

Since then, the UN has designated 1983-92 as the Decade of Disabled Persons and UNHCR's commitment to ongoing assistance to refugees has also increased significantly. Allocations for rehabilitation of the handicapped were $223,900 in 1982, $300,000 in 1983, and $835,000 in 1984. The proposed 1985 allocation is $700,000.

Disabled Refugees Identified

The Sudan study, carried out by an Experiment in International Living (EIL) team for UNHCR...
and the Sudan's Office of the Commissioner for Refugees, was submitted in July. Of 4,933 households surveyed in Khartoum and in three settlements in the Eastern region of the Sudan, 338 had a disabled person who was not elderly or bedridden. The study excluded those categories because it focused on the training needs of job-ready disabled refugees.

The general low level of education and literacy among disabled refugees, particularly in the settlements, is an obstacle to their self-reliance, the study found. The study points to the need for adult basic education, and adds that if vocational skills training and employment opportunities were available in the settlements, fewer refugees would migrate to Khartoum.

Lack of mobility was a major problem for many of the disabled. Over 40 percent said they could not engage in community activities and 25 percent reportedly could not use transport. Mobility training programs are recommended to enable these people to be more self-reliant.

Disabled refugees identified, in order of priority, the need for medical intervention, employment, and acceptance by their community as their most acute problems. While 85 percent said that they would join a training program, most were unable to name a job for which they could be trained, or expressed clearly unrealistic goals in view of their disability.

Agencies Offer Variety of Services The study team visited 26 agencies providing services to the disabled, including programs funded by the government of the Sudan and by international donor agencies. In addition to programs providing medical intervention and education and training, several income-generating programs were also visited.

One project, the Sudan Aid Vulnerable Groups Project in Gedaref, assists the most vulnerable members of the refugee population, including disabled refugees, to achieve economic self-reliance by developing individual income-generating projects, production workshops, and community centers.

Recommendations Stress Coordination "To be successful, any effort to address the needs of disabled refugees must be seen in the larger context of development," said Peter Falion of EIL, a member of the study team. This is consistent with the major theme of the recent ICARA II conference—how refugee services in Africa can be developed when nations' services for their own people are severely strained.

Falion indicated that one of the study's most important recommendations was the establishment of an interagency task force on disability to act as a planning and coordinating group, a catalyst for new programs, and an advocate for the disabled.

The study also recommends that UNHCR and the government fund a position as coordinator for disability services to coordinate the diverse and often isolated efforts on behalf of disabled refugees and Sudanese nationals.

The need to integrate services for the disabled with services for the able is also crucial, according to Falion. "It's important not to pigeonhole the disabled and put them into make-work programs," he said. "They can do many of the same things the able can do, but efforts are required to educate people of this important fact." He said that the problems of disabled refugees must be seen as part of larger problems. "Efforts to help the disabled will only work if they are done in connection with improving overall health care for the nation as a whole."

Medical and Training Needs These two themes—coordinating efforts for refugees and Sudanese and coordinating efforts for the disabled and the able—run throughout the study's recommendations.

For example, a mobile diagnostic screening and treatment clinic and a community rehabilitation/health worker program to train people in refugee settlements and Sudanese villages to provide counseling, health education, and training are recommended. But Falion stressed that such programs should not have two tracks, one for refugees and one for Sudanese nationals. He said the situations in the refugee settlements and the local villages are very much alike. The study report says, "What is not needed at this time nor affordable at any time are separate rehabilitation programs for refugees only, implemented along an independent track from programs implemented for disabled nationals."

The study also recommends that efforts
be made whenever possible to integrate disabled children and adults into existing education programs. Integrating the disabled into existing programs would be less expensive and would result in more opportunities for the disabled to receive education.

The study found effective income-generating programs for the disabled already in place and recommended that support for them be expanded. But it also recommended that new income-generation projects for refugees have quotas for disabled refugees since many have the skills needed for such projects. The study states, "The UNHCR should take the lead in establishing quotas by ensuring that a certain percentage of jobs within its own organization are filled by disabled people."

Disability prevention measures, including immunization and child nutrition programs and general health education, should be strengthened, according to the study. Other recommendations include establishment of a vocational training center in Khartoum, a campaign to educate the general public about the disabled, and the elimination of architectural barriers.

Falion expressed the hope that some actions will be taken. The amount of research done in the Sudan has raised expectations. "Settlement leaders and government officials said that people in settlements have been researched and researched, but they haven't seen much action," Falion said.

UNHCR Addresses Needs in Other Countries
UNHCR's funding for the disabled is allocated for special projects and for services—hospitalization, surgery, travel for specialized treatment, vocational rehabilitation, psychotherapy, physical therapy, equipment, and diagnostic, medical, and rehabilitation fees—to individuals.

Rehabilitation and training centers for handicapped refugees are being established in Tanzania in cooperation with private voluntary organizations. UNHCR funded the transfer of 40 disabled Namibian refugees from Angola to Zambia to be trained as vocational training instructors. On return, they will train other disabled refugees at vocational centers. In Zaire, a project has established facilities for the manufacture of prostheses.

A survey of handicapped cases in all refugee camps in Somalia is being carried out. Funds have also been obligated to identify and rehabilitate disabled Afghan refugees in Pakistan.

In Costa Rica, UNHCR's 1985 proposal includes specialized assistance to some 40 refugee victims of torture. Programs in Belgium, West Germany, and Spain are also designed to deal with the psychological disorders of refugees there.

UNHCR has obligated $75,000 in 1984 to allow injured Palestinian civilians now in Egypt to receive treatment at a new Center for Rehabilitation and Treatment of the Elderly and Disabled in Yugoslavia, for which UNHCR provided equipment.

PROVIDENCE YOUTH BRIDGE RACIAL DIFFERENCES WITH DRAMA PROJECT

Eight Providence, Rhode Island, students became playwrights, directors, and actors this summer, creating and performing "The Brotherhood of Man: A Celebration of Multicultural Friendship." Performed in the city's parks, the program brought the Southeast Asian, Black, and Hispanic youth together to dramatize their feelings about relationships between young people of different races or ethnicities.

The cast included three Blacks, one Hispanic, three Hmong, and one Cambodian between the ages of 10 and 14. Each of them created and directed one of the eight skits that made up the program, according to Christopher Burke of the Providence Human Relations Commission, the project director.

Skits' Characters Overcome Differences In one skit, a Black girl and an Hispanic girl sit together in a pizza parlor talking about the funny clothes and the strange, long hair of two Asian girls. The two Asian girls approach and point out that the other two are different from each other and still friends. Soon, talk among the four turns to boys, pizza, clothes, and other shared concerns of youth.

Burke said a common theme in the Asian students' skits was pressure from their peers if they open up to others. One of their skits had two Black girls asking if they could join two Asians who are playing together. The Asian girls say, "No, our friends wouldn't understand." But the Black girls persist, saying everyone is
really the same, so why shouldn't they all play together?

Other segments of the program included an Asian dance, rap dancing, and a pantomime by a Hmong girl about her Black friend taking her to the library.

Theatre Project Chosen to Encourage Communication The Providence Human Relations Commission initiated the project after a 1982 survey indicated a need to reach out to the new Asian refugees. According to Burke, refugees' presence in urban ghettos caused resentment. For instance, he said, some of the refugees, by working hard and helping each other, did well enough to buy cars. Their successes created a feeling that the sponsors did more for refugees than the government did for other minorities. There were some beatings and other incidents.

The Human Relations Commission chose theatre, Burke said, because of its universality. "We felt the communities were relatively compact, so if you could reach a segment, the word would spread." The word they wanted to spread was, "separation of people at the bottom of the social ladder is foolish." Burke said they rejected the usual approach of organizing a conference, as these often reach people already concerned.

The project received funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, the Providence Department of Parks, and the Rhode Island Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Burke and project coordinator, Julia Rollins, involved mutual assistance associations in the early stages of the project, helping to overcome their misgivings. Though some questions remained, refugee leaders cooperated and chose the Southeast Asian children to participate. Rehearsals began with artistic director Robb Dimmick and Williams College student Gillian Davies in July.

Participation Changed Misconceptions The experience taught the participants about their own relationships and broke down some of their sense of being different. Initially, Burke said, the young Black actors were the most comfortable and were able to control the situation, forming an alliance with the Hispanic girl against the Asians. The group had to go to lunch together and, while they did not all end up best friends, they became more and more relaxed. Friendships shifted and a sense of being comrade in a troupe of actors developed.

The experience of producing and performing in the program overcame misconceptions, Burke said, particularly the stereotype about Asian deference, shyness, and reserve. There was anger and even bullying by each of the groups, and the Asian youth became more vocal. Although the students continued to tend to separate themselves along ethnic lines, Burke said, "I think if they're in their own groups now, they'll speak up about their experiences and defend others who are different.''

Audiences Mostly Sympathetic Burke said the impact on audiences was more difficult to judge. The performances were held in parks and a busy downtown mall, which was somewhat distracting, but Burke thought that most people stayed to the end of the 20- or 30-minute performances. For many, the program may have been "preaching to the converted," Burke said. Many people may have seen it as a nice children's play and gone away "with a benign, self-satisfied feeling, which is fine," he said, but they may have been missing the more troubling issues underlying the skits.

Cleo LaChapelle, Rhode Island refugee coordinator, said, "The program was a modest positive step in the right direction. It opened doors to dialogue between minorities and got people thinking." The program was very inexpensive, he added. With one of every eight students in the Providence schools a refugee, he would like to see the effort continued in the schools.

Plans to Take Program to Schools, Repeat with Adults The Providence Human Relations Commission wants to bring the program into the public schools so it can reach "others than the already converted," Burke said. The Providence school system has agreed to share funding and provide facilities and equipment to videotape the program for use in middle and high schools. The commission will provide someone from the project staff when the program is used in schools, to keep discussions focused on the issues raised.

The Commission has also received tentative approval from the State Council on the Arts for funding of a similar project.
involving adults. The Council recently re-
ceived a grant to be directed toward minor-
ity communities, Burke said. The adult
program will be virtually the same as this
summer's youth program in concept, but,
Burke said, "with adults, we would like to
do something more soul-searching." He added
that everyone involved in the project felt
that adults have had a longer and deeper
experience of prejudice than children. They
have more to bring out and can handle a
deeper exposure of prejudice than children
can.

For the adult program, a writer may be
included to work with the participants and
develop an actual script from their input.
Burke said he would like to see the adult
performances held indoors to be more con-
ducive to having discussions afterwards.

LaChapelle said that he would be sup-
portive of an adult program. "It's a good
way to go about getting people to under-
stand, to improve communications with the
Southeast Asian community. We need to get
people to talk." The adult program is
scheduled to begin in the spring of 1985
with performances in the summer.

Reader Exchange

WORKSHOPS ON ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR NONPROFITS

New Ventures, a consultancy to nonprofit
organizations, is hosting a series of
workshops at several sites in the U.S.
entitled "Enterprise and Nonprofit
Organizations: Earned Income for Self-
Sufficiency." Led by president Edward
Skloot, the workshops will address organi-
zational, legal, tax, financial, and
marketing issues facing nonprofit in-
stitutions. Workshops are scheduled for
December 4 in Washington, D.C.; December 11
in Boston; December 13 and January 17 in
New York City; January 8 in New Brunswick,
NJ; and January 17 in Philadelphia.

The registration fee is $110, though
organizations sending more than one person
are eligible for a discount. For more
information, contact Edward Skloot, New
Ventures, 251 Park Avenue South, 12th
floor, New York, New York 10010. Tel.
(212) 674-0730.

Resources

VIETNAMESE AND KHMER LITERATURE FROM YALE PRESS

Yale University Press has available several
publications on Vietnamese heritage. Gerald
Cannon Hickey has written a two-volume study
on ethnohistory of the Vietnamese Central
Highlands. Sons of the Mountain traces his-
torical developments from prehistoric ages
1954, looking at diverse ethnic heritages
and interrelated economic, political, reli-
$50]. The second book in the series, Free
in the Forest, looks at developments from
the time of the 1954 Geneva Agreements up
to 1976, including the Vietnam War and its
aftermath [1982, 376 pp., $35].

The Heritage of Vietnamese Poetry is an
anthology of 480 traditional poems original-
ly written in Vietnamese or Chinese since
the tenth century. Edited and translated by Huynh Sanh Thong, the book includes six
well-known poems, "The Song of a Soldier's
Wife," "A Plaint inside the Royal Harem,"
"Calling All Wandering Souls," "The Quarrel
of the Six Domestic Beasts," "The Catfish
and the Toad," and "The Debate between the
Flowers and the Birds" [1979, 352 pp., $30].

An abridged version of an earlier book,
Big Story: How the American Press and
Television Reported and Interpreted the
Crisis of Tet 1968 in Vietnam and Washington
scrutinizes how the landmark event was
presented to the public. Written by Peter
Baestrup [1983, 446 pp., $9.95 paperback].

Of interest for Khmer speakers are sev-
eral language books. English for Speakers
of Khmer, by Franklin E. Huffman and Im
Proum, includes information on Khmer lan-
guage structure and pronunciation, and 15
English lessons [1982, 608 pp., $40 hard-
bound, $12.95 paperback].

Also by the same authors is a Cambodian-
English Glossary designed to assist Khmer
speakers in study of English [1977, 160
pp., $7.95], and English-Khmer Dictionary,
cited as the first of its kind in the West-
ern world [1978, 712 pp., $40].

The above books can be ordered from the
Sales Department, Yale University Press,
92A Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.
Tel.(203) 432-4969. Include $2 postage per
book. (Conn. residents add 7.5% tax.)
### FY 84 Refugee Arrivals as of September 30, 1984 (All Nationalities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YTD FY 84</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YTD FY 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>5268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>MOUNT DAKOTA</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>1163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>2155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>3274</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>5616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>2976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>AMERICAN SAMOA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>GUAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>JOHNSTON ATOLL</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>NO. MARIANA ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>MIDWAY ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>TONGA TERRITORIES</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>VIRGIN ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>WAKE ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL YTD FY 84</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,998</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country of Birthplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>CIT.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGOLA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>2469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY (REICH)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY (FEDERAL)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>2770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMPUCHEA</td>
<td>16,193</td>
<td>19,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUWAIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACO</td>
<td>6365</td>
<td>7172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBYA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUGENDRA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL YTD FY 84</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,998</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,998</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information in this report is based on documents from ACVA, ICM and other federal agencies available on the date of this report and may not include information on all refugees in the categories reported.

**Note:** Children born in refugee camps are assigned citizenship of parents. Citizenship information is often lacking, especially for non-Southeast Asians.

**Source:** Office of Refugee Resettlement
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The White House announced that the U.S. and Cuba reached an agreement on December 14 for the return of 2,746 Cubans who came to the U.S. during the 1980 Mariel boatlift but were declared ineligible to remain in the U.S. The agreement also provides for the resumption of normal immigration from Cuba to the U.S. for up to 20,000 Cuban nationals each year and for the resettlement as refugees of Cubans who have been released after serving sentences in Cuba for "crimes against the security of the state" according to Cuban law. The U.S. delegation stated that to this end the necessary steps have been taken for admission during FY 85 of up to 3,000 such persons, including immediate family members, according to the U.S. government communique. The U.S. refugee admissions ceiling for FY 85 for Latin America and the Caribbean is 3,000.

The agreement also included a decision for Cuban and U.S. representatives to meet again within six months to "analyze progress in the implementation of these agreements."

The White House press release on the agreement described those to be returned to Cuba as "ineligible to remain in the U.S. because they admitted to committing serious crimes in Cuba, have committed serious crimes in the U.S., or suffer from severe mental disorders."

While the agreement states that the return of the Cubans will be through an "orderly program of returns with the cooperation of the immigration authorities of both countries...in a phased and orderly manner until all the identified individuals who appear on the approved list have been returned," concerns have already been expressed about the legality of the return.

On October 15, in U.S. district court in Atlanta, Judge Marvin H. Shoob ruled that the government could not deport some 1,500 Cubans detained in the federal penitentiary in Atlanta until their asylum claims were reviewed. Judge Shoob said the Board of Immigration Appeals had prejudged the merits of two cases under review and disregarded evidence that the Cubans had a well-founded fear of persecution if returned to Cuba. The court said there was evidence of a well-founded fear of persecution because of the Cuban government's demonstrated attitudes toward the Marielitos as a group. On December 13, the government appealed Judge Shoob's decision that the cases be reopened by the
Board of Immigration Appeals and considered on the merits of the asylum claims. The outcome of this appeal will have important implications for the plans to return the "excludable" Cubans to Cuba.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) program to register Cubans who entered the U.S. during the 1980 Mariel boatlift began December 3. Mariel Cubans who wish to be considered by INS for adjustment to permanent resident status have been registering through participating local voluntary agencies.

According to INS, the registration has been going well. As of December 14, approximately 26,000 had registered in Miami, exceeding INS expectations. Approximately 2500 had registered in Newark by December 14. This somewhat slow reported rate was attributed to the procedure being used there to process forms before turning them over to INS. Sources at INS said reports from New York were still inconclusive about the rate of registration there.

A thorough assessment of the registration program will not be possible until after January 1. At that time, INS will consider whether a second publicity campaign is warranted. Little registration was expected in the second half of December because of the other commitments of voluntary agencies during the holiday season.

The Department of Justice took action on December 18 to continue extended voluntary departure (EVD) through June 30, 1985, for Poles who entered the U.S. before July 21, 1984. The decision to extend EVD for Poles was based on a State Department recommendation, which cited U.S. foreign policy objectives. The protection against being involuntarily returned to Poland was initiated after martial law was imposed in Poland in December 1981. The current extension is renewable and applies to all Poles except those who indicate a willingness to return, who are residents of a third country, or who have been convicted of a crime in the U.S.

Extended voluntary departure is currently available to Afghans, Ethiopians, and Ugandans, as well as Poles.

CORRECTION: Refugee Reports Vol. V. Nos. 19/20 cited incorrect figures for the Hmong population in Philadelphia. According to sources in that city, the Hmong population in 1976-78 was 2,500 to 3,000. Beginning in the summer of 1980, large numbers began to migrate to other states -- especially Michigan, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. Others later moved on to Minnesota and California. Early in 1982, the estimated population was 700-800. Other outmigration occurred earlier this year, leaving an estimated 350-400. While violence against the Hmong has occurred, the primary reasons for the movement from Philadelphia are thought to be related to the community's leadership.

Vietnamese officials have told a U.S.
## Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals by Nationality: FY 75–85

### Federal Fiscal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Laos</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>19,849</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>24,927</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>23,459</td>
<td>39,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>20,234</td>
<td>9,437</td>
<td>43,656</td>
<td>73,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>86,100</td>
<td>132,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>166,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>80,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976*</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>130,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109,600</td>
<td>143,900</td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>712,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes transition quarter.

REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Laos</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Czechoslovakia</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Poland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7,925</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>17,096</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 33,040 10,170 47,957 2,059 1,181 9,488

1Total includes other countries of citizenship not shown, generally countries with smaller numbers of arrivals.

STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT FY 83 AND FY 84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>USSR</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8,012 2,118 5,053 4,897 3,745 1,766 131,253
### Southeast Asian Refugees: Estimated Cumulative State Populations

**Including Entries from 1975 through 9/30/84**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>285,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>19,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>22,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>24,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>23,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>51,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>32,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Territories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>711,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** New adjustments for secondary migration were incorporated into these estimates as of 9/30/84.

*Adjusted for secondary migration through 9/30/84, rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: Office of Refugee Resettlement
DISTRIBUTION OF AGE AND GENDER FOR FY 84 REFUGEE ARRIVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4,729 (6.8%)</td>
<td>4,624 (6.6%)</td>
<td>9,353 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>4,497 (6.4%)</td>
<td>3,845 (5.5%)</td>
<td>8,342 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>6,728 (9.6%)</td>
<td>4,472 (6.4%)</td>
<td>11,200 (16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>2,769 (4.0%)</td>
<td>1,480 (2.1%)</td>
<td>4,249 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>2,271 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1,387 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3,658 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>2,738 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2,000 (2.9%)</td>
<td>4,738 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>7,723 (11.0%)</td>
<td>6,135 (8.8%)</td>
<td>13,858 (19.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3,958 (5.7%)</td>
<td>3,360 (4.8%)</td>
<td>7,318 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1,975 (2.8%)</td>
<td>1,773 (2.5%)</td>
<td>3,748 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>938 (1.3%)</td>
<td>1,130 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2,068 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and up</td>
<td>603 (.9%)</td>
<td>854 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1,457 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 38,92 (55.6%) 31,060 (44.4%) 69,998 (100.0%)

NOTE: All percentages are percentages of total population, 69,998. Total may not equal 100% because of rounding off.

Source: Office of Refugee Resettlement, based on documents from ACVA, ICM and other federal agencies (may not include information on all refugees in the categories reported).
### CASH ASSISTANCE DEPENDENCY AMONG TIME ELIGIBLE REFUGEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Estimated Time-Eligible Refugee Population</th>
<th>Total Caseload</th>
<th>Dependency Rate (in %)</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Estimated Time-Eligible Refugee Population</th>
<th>Total Caseload</th>
<th>Dependency Rate (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>9,147</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>105,164</td>
<td>91,469</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5,777</td>
<td>5,255</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8,003</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>21,650</td>
<td>9,126</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>23,175</td>
<td>23,175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>23,175</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10,676</td>
<td>10,676</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10,676</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>12,440</td>
<td>12,440</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>12,440</td>
<td>5,572</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316,090</td>
<td>165,433</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These estimates include all refugees resented in the prior three fiscal years but exclude Cubans and Haitian entrants. State estimates include adjustments for secondary migration based on the best available data; though the estimates are shown to the last digit, they must be considered approximate. At the national level, secondary migration is not a factor and the time-eligible population is an actual count.

### REFUGEE PRIORITIES CATEGORIES BEING PROCESSED, BY REGION, FY 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>S.E. Asia</th>
<th>East. Europe/ U.S.R.R.</th>
<th>Near East/ South Asia</th>
<th>Latin Am./ Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>Compling Concern/Interest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>Former U.S. Government Employees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3</td>
<td>Family Reunification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-4</td>
<td>Other Ties to the U.S.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5</td>
<td>Additional Family Reunification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6</td>
<td>Otherwise of National Interest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Southeast Asian refugees in priority six who arrived in first asylum countries prior to April 30, 1982 will be processed. Anyone in priority six who arrived in a first asylum country after that date will not be processed.

**Explanation of priority categories:**

- **PRIORITY ONE—Compelling Concern/Interest:** Exceptional cases a) of refugees in immediate danger of loss of life and for whom there appears to be no alternative to resettlement in the U.S.; or b) of refugees of compelling concern to the U.S., such as former or present political prisoners and dissidents.

- **PRIORITY TWO—Former U.S. Government employees:** Refugees employed by the U.S. government for at least one year prior to the claim for refugee status. This category also includes persons who were not official U.S. government employees, but who, for at least one year, were so integrated into U.S. government offices as to have been in effect and appearance U.S. government employees.

- **PRIORITY THREE—Family Reunification:** Refugees who are spouses, sons, daughters, parents, grandparents, unmarried siblings, or unmarried minor grandchildren of persons in the U.S. (The status of the anchor relative in the U.S. must be one of the following: U.S. citizen, lawful permanent resident alien, refugee, or asylee.)

- **PRIORITY FOUR—Other Ties to the United States:** a) Refugees employed by U.S. foundations, U.S. voluntary agencies, or U.S. business firms for at least one year prior to the claim refugee status, and b) refugees trained or educated in the U.S. or abroad under U.S. auspices.

- **PRIORITY FIVE—Additional family reunification:** Refugees who are married siblings, unmarried grandchildren who have reached their majority, or married grandchildren of persons in the United States; also more distantly related individuals who are part of the family group and dependent on the family for support. (The status of the anchor relative in the U.S. must be one of the following: U.S. citizen, lawful permanent resident alien, refugee, or asylee.)

- **PRIORITY SIX—Other of national interest:** Other refugees in specified regional groups whose admission is in the national interest.

**Source:** U.S. Department of State
ACTUAL REFUGEE ADMISSIONS TO THE U.S. AND CEILINGS ON REFUGEE ADMISSIONS, FY 75-85

Total Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>146,158</td>
<td>27,206</td>
<td>19,946</td>
<td>36,507</td>
<td>111,363</td>
<td>207,116</td>
<td>159,252</td>
<td>97,355</td>
<td>61,681</td>
<td>71,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau for Refugee Programs/DOS.
### INDOCHINESE REFUGEE PROGRAM

**AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1984 and FY 84 CUMULATIVE**

#### ARRIVALS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Boat</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>26,097</td>
<td>32,847</td>
<td>600,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>18,082</td>
<td>8,121</td>
<td>552,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct (includes ODP)</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>28,340</td>
<td>15,631</td>
<td>455,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Arrivals</strong></td>
<td>6,731</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>72,319</td>
<td>56,599</td>
<td>1,507,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RESETTLEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

**Vietnamese:**
- **Boat and Land:**
  - Sept. 1984: 2,540
  - Sept. 1983: 2,041
- **Direct to U.S. 1975:**
  - Sept. 1984: 0
  - Sept. 1983: 0
- **Direct (ODP):**
  - Sept. 1984: 690
  - Sept. 1983: 711
  - Subtotal: 2,370
- **Cumulative from April 1975:**
  - Total Boat: 31,908

**Khmer:**
- **Arrivals:**
  - Sept. 1984: 1,672
  - Sept. 1983: 1,146
- **Cumulative from April 1975:**
  - Total Boat: 19,851

**Lao:**
- **Arrivals:**
  - Sept. 1984: 366
  - Sept. 1983: 1,022
- **Cumulative from April 1975:**
  - Total Boat: 4,538

**Highlanders:**
- **Arrivals:**
  - Sept. 1984: 735
  - Sept. 1983: 138
- **Cumulative from April 1975:**
  - Total Boat: 2,753

#### TOTAL DEPARTURES TO THE U.S.

- **Vietnamese:**
  - Total Arrivals: 6,731
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 60,304

- **Khmer:**
  - Total Arrivals: 4,732
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 55,212

- **Lao:**
  - Total Arrivals: 5,937
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 45,521

- **Highlanders:**
  - Total Arrivals: 2,370
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 19,876

#### RESETTLEMENT IN THIRD COUNTRIES

- **Direct to PRC 1977-1979:**
  - Sept. 1984: 0
  - Sept. 1983: 0
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 263,080

- **Direct (ODP):**
  - Sept. 1984: 1,592
  - Sept. 1983: 1,292
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 41,602

- **From First Asylum and RPC's:**
  - Sept. 1984: 1,854
  - Sept. 1983: 2,172
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 383,133

#### TOTAL DEPARTURES TO OTHER COUNTRIES

- **Total Departures:**
  - Sept. 1984: 3,464
  - Sept. 1983: 3,437
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 715,459

#### CURRENT CAMP POPULATION:

- **Indochinese Refugees in First Asylum:** 158,233
- **Indochinese Refugee/Dependents in ESL/CO:** 22,942
- **ODP Refugees in Transit in Bangkok:** 215

#### TOTAL CAMP POPULATION:

- **Total Indochinese Refugee Camp Populations:** 181,390

#### REFUGEE DEPARTURES TO THE U.S.

- **Total Additional Departures:**
  - Sept. 1984: 3
  - Sept. 1983: 30
  - **Cumulative from April 1975:**
    - Total Boat: 47,616

### ORDERLY DEPARTURE PROGRAM MOVEMENTS (as of 08/31/84)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>7/79-9/81</th>
<th>10/81-9/82</th>
<th>10/82-9/83</th>
<th>10/83-8/84</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>11,554</td>
<td>24,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>12,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>11,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>2,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,455</td>
<td>12,473</td>
<td>15,631</td>
<td>25,594</td>
<td>67,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Orderly Departure Program is an international effort, involving more than 40 receiving countries. In addition to the U.S., Australia, Canada and France manage their own programs. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees manages the programs for the other countries (and assists on the U.S. program).

## SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEE DEPARTURES TO U.S. AND THIRD COUNTRIES
### AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DEPARTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Rep. of Germany</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Less than .1 percent
b) Totals may be less than 100 percent because of rounding off

Source: Bureau for Refugee Programs/Department of State
# Indochinese Refugees by Ethnic Group

## Camp Populations as of 10/31/84

### General

Refugees in all camps/countries in Southeast and East Asia:

- Lao: 25,460
- Highlanders: 54,582
- Khmer: 50,581
- Vietnamese: 50,995

**Total:** 181,618

### Country Camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Lao</th>
<th>Highlanders</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Ban Nam Yao</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ban Vinai</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>40,456</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Kham</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kao Chermq</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khao I Dang</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,353</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakhon Phanom</td>
<td>21,599</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phanat Nikhom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Asylum</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL/CO</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sikhiu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Songkla</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Ctrs</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ubon:*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recep. Ctr.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. Repat. Ctr.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>23,665</td>
<td>54,582</td>
<td>44,088</td>
<td>5,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Pulau Bidonq</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KL Trans. Ctr.:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sungel Besi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Hawkins Camp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Sendanau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarampa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjung Pinaq</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuku</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galang</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em><strong>RPC</strong></em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Palawan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bataan RPC</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,484</td>
<td>8,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,484</td>
<td>10,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Open Camps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed Camps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>25,460</td>
<td>54,582</td>
<td>50,581</td>
<td>50,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Ubon reception center has refugees awaiting movement to Nakhon Phanom, while the host refugees in the Songkla reception center are awaiting movement to Sikhiu. The Ubon voluntary repatriation center holds refugees awaiting voluntary repatriation to Laos.

**NOTE:** This table does not include 286 Vietnamese ODP refugees in transit in Bangkok.

**Source:** Bureau for Refugee Programs/ DOS
ESTIMATED COSTS OF REFUGEE MOVEMENT TO AND RESETTLEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES
FY 84 AND FY 85
(dollars in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>For Arrivals</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>For Arrivals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 84</td>
<td>in FY 85</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau for Refugee Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcom's Services Overseas</td>
<td>$17.0</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/Orientation Programs Overseas</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Loans</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception and Placement Agreements</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$106.0</td>
<td>$117.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$117.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Refugee Resettlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administered Programs</td>
<td>494.7</td>
<td>475.8</td>
<td>247.2</td>
<td>355.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Agency Programs</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Health</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Administration</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$509.6</td>
<td>$107.3</td>
<td>$247.2</td>
<td>$354.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other HHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Families With Dependent Children</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$155.3</td>
<td>$22.3</td>
<td>$87.4</td>
<td>$109.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>$150.5</td>
<td>$26.1</td>
<td>$100.6</td>
<td>$126.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$933.4</td>
<td>$272.9</td>
<td>$435.2</td>
<td>$708.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b/ Includes funds for refugee assistance only. Cuban/Haitian entrant funds that are appropriated for use by ORR not included.

b/ Includes cost estimates only for refugees' first 12 months in the U.S.


UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE SITUATIONS FY 84 AND FY 85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>FY 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa: East Asia: Indochinese</td>
<td>$420,000,000</td>
<td>$460,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa: Orderly Departure Program</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia: Anti-Piracy Program</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America: El Salvador</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East and South Asia: Pakistan</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$20,100,000</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR Subtotal</td>
<td>$98,125,000</td>
<td>$100,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>FY 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa: East Asia: Indochinese</td>
<td>$67,000,000</td>
<td>$67,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa: Other Assistance</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$20,625,000</td>
<td>$20,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA Subtotal</td>
<td>$825,000,000</td>
<td>$825,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>FY 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa: Special Projects</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa: East Asia: Refugee Relief</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC Subtotal</td>
<td>$20,625,000</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>FY 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America: El Salvador</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assistance</td>
<td>$7,600,000</td>
<td>$8,605,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Refugee Program</td>
<td>$226,650,000</td>
<td>$224,205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>FY 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food for Peace (PL-480, Title II)</td>
<td>$30,800,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$30,800,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assistance</td>
<td>$233,450,000</td>
<td>$224,205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Refugee Program</td>
<td>$226,650,000</td>
<td>$224,205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>FY 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food for Peace (PL-480, Title II)</td>
<td>$30,800,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$30,800,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assistance</td>
<td>$233,450,000</td>
<td>$224,205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Refugee Program</td>
<td>$226,650,000</td>
<td>$224,205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a/ Funding in FY 84 from the Economic Support Fund (ESF).
b/ Does not include refugee contributions equivalent to $3.8 million for UNHCR, $750,000 for ICRC, $1 million for the League of Red Cross Societies in FY 84 and similar amounts in FY 85.
c/ The Political Detainees program is now covered through contributions to regional programs.
d/ Portions of these funds are associated with the costs of the United States refugee admissions program.
e/ For Pakistan, Kampuchea, and Somalia in FY 85.
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**AFRICA**
- Malian Discuss Programs to Assist African Refugees
  - Sudan Refugee Commissioner Describes Current Situation in Northeast Africa
  - Sudan Study Reflects UNHCR efforts on behalf of Disabled Refugees

**ASIANS**
- Administration Proposes Special Initiatives on Amerasians and Noneducation Camp Prisoners, Small Reduction in Refugee Admissions
  - American Immigration May Be Jeopardized by Political Differences
  - Administration Proposes Special Initiatives on Amerasians and Sudan Study Reflects UNRCR Efforts on Behalf of Disabled Refugees
  - Administration Proposes Special Initiatives on Amerasians and Sudan Study Reflects UNRCR Efforts on Behalf of Disabled Refugees

**AMERICAN**
- Administration Proposes Special Initiatives on Amerasians and Noneducation Camp Prisoners, Small Reduction in Refugee Admissions
  - Administration Proposes Special Initiatives on Amerasians and Sudan Study Reflects UNRCR Efforts on Behalf of Disabled Refugees

**APRIL**
- Cambodian Traditional Music in Minnesota and Khamvong
  - Insixiengmai: Thinking of the Old Village (Cambodian music with booklets)
  - Immigrant and Refugee Experience Performed in Southern California
  - Providence Youth Bridge Social Differences with Drama Project
  - Texas Gulf Coast Calm—New Film Depicts Conflict Between Vietnamese and Texas Shrimpers
  - Vietnamese and Khmer Literature and English for Khmer, Yale University Press

**ASSISTANCE**
- Age Discrepancies Cause Problems for Older Refugees
  - Refugee Act Reauthorization Bill Amended by Senate Committee
  - OSSC Demonstration Project Results Show Efforts to Expand

**BUDGET**
- Congress Tells ORR to Restore Social Services Allocation Level

**CAMBODIA/REFUGEE FROM CAMBODIA**
- Cambodian Traditional Music in Minnesota and Khamvong
  - Insixiengmai: Thinking of the Old Village (Cambodian music with booklets)
  - Guide to Your Neighborhood and Medical Guide (Cambodian guide booklet)
  - INS Guidelines for Overseas Processing of Refugees Evaluated, Problems Identified
  - Senate Staff Report Suggests Alternatives to Reeducation Camp Prisoners, Small Reduction in Refugee Admissions
  - Video Project in Arizona Introduces Family Planning Methods
  - Vietnamese and Khamvong Literature and English for Khmer, Yale University Press
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**CENTRAL AMERICA**
- Central American Youths Deported or Detained at U.S. Border
  - Court Upheld Administration's Denial of Extended Voluntary Departure for Salvadorans
  - Directory of Central America Organizations
  - A Salvadoran Other Events: The War on the Displaced, Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights and Americas Watch
  - Present: refugees (slide/tape show)
  - la Frontera (slide/tape show)
  - Sanctuary Movement Worker Tried and Sentenced in Texas
  - Union Claims Due Process Denied to Salvadorans in Suit Against U.S.
  - Writers Bulletin (bibliography of articles on Central America)

**CONGRESS**
- Administration Proposes Special Initiatives on Amerasians and Noneducation Camp Prisoners, Small Reduction in Refugee Admissions
  - Congress Approves Transfer of 2,000 to Southeast Asia FY 84 admissions ceiling (update)
  - Congress Tells ORR to Restore Social Services Allocation Level
  - House Passes Simpson-Mazzoli Immigration Bill
  - Poll Finds U.S. Public Favora Responsible, Responsive Refugee Admissions
  - Refugee Act Reauthorization Bill Amended by Senate Committee
  - Senate Has Not Reauthorized Refugee Act: Continuing Resolution Passed by House (update)
  - Senate Staff Report Suggests Alternatives to Reeducation Camp Prisoners, Small Reduction in Refugee Admissions

**CUBAN/MARIAL**
- Excludable Mariel Cubans May Be Returned to Cuba
  - INS Announces Program to Grant Permanent Resident Status to Excludable Mariel Cubans
  - Lawsuit Seeks to Stop Haitian Interdiction Program
  - U.S. and Cuba Reach Agreement on Return of Excludable Mariel Cubans (update)

**EDUCATION**
- Iowa Refugee Program Produces Innovations in Job Development and Literacy Training

**EMPLOYMENT**
- Iowa Refugee Program Produces Innovations in Job Development and Literacy Training
  - USCC Demonstration Project Results Show Efforts to Expand
  - You Deserve a Break Today: Tax Credit Encourages McDonald's, Other Employers to Hire Targeted Groups

**ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ESL)**
- A Study of English Language Training for Refugees in the United States, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory for ORR
  - Vietnamese and Khmer Literature and English for Khmer, Yale University Press

**FAMILIES/REFUGEES**
- Cross-Cultural Medical Program for Chicago area hospitals
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**1983 CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE AID AGENCIES**
Top 20 Refugee Aid Agencies (in millions of $)
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